

THEOLOGY

A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF
HISTORIC CHRISTIANITY

EDITED BY S. C. CARPENTER, D.D.

VOLUME XXVIII.

JANUARY—JUNE, 1934

LONDON

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE

THEOLOGY

A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF
HISTORIC CHRISTIANITY

EDITED BY S. C. CARPENTER, D.D.

VOLUME XXVII

JANUARY-JUNE 1904

THE
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the REV. S. C. CARPENTER, B.D., MASTER OF THE TEMPLE, c/o S.P.C.K.
HOUSE, NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, LONDON, W.C. 2, to whom MSS.
should be sent.

Vol. XXVIII

JANUARY, 1934

No. 163

EDITORIAL

WITH the December number of this Journal the Dean of Winchester laid down his editorial pen. The Church of England, the whole Anglican Communion, and indeed no small part of Christendom beyond our own borders, have been strengthened in sound learning by his thirteen years of work. Those who remember him as the brilliant undergraduate at King's, and then as a leader in that group of "younger Cambridge theologians" from whom so much was expected, and were full of hope when he was invited to assume control of THEOLOGY in 1920, that year of problems and visions, will look back with praise to God and gratitude to him for what has been accomplished. There were, as always, the timid obscurantists and the reckless innovators. But there was also a large body of Churchmen, lay as well as clerical, who, in the tradition of *Lux Mundi*, were eager to "attempt to put the Catholic Faith into its right relation to modern intellectual and moral problems." They approved this way of ordering the sentence, because they thought of the Catholic Faith as a dynamic thing, which, not content with placidly, or defiantly, demanding that the problems should be brought into the right relation to itself, would prove able to reach out, and meet and overcome the problems. To many such THEOLOGY has been a rallying-point for defence, and a starting-point for fresh enquiry. To its contributors, correspondents, reviewers, and readers it has owed much. To the faith, wisdom and courage of its editor it has owed most of all. *In necessariis unitas, in non necessariis libertas, in omnibus caritas* might have been his motto. Sound in the central core of devotion to the Redeemer, sound in the consequent region of loyalty to the Faith, he has been bold and he has been considerate.

His successor, inheriting a strong tradition, and having in the Editorial Secretary of S.P.C.K. a wise counsellor, to whom

he already owes much, and will owe more and more as time goes on, is eager to maintain the truth, and to find it wherever it may be, and by whatever name it may be called. To the Church of God in Cambridge, Cuddesdon, London, Lancashire, he owes all that he is. Of that Church he thinks *in primis* as a true part of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, and, not in spite of that but rather because of it, he has for the Church of England and the Book of Common Prayer a singular, even a passionate regard. Indeed, of many a knotty problem he is accustomed to believe that *solvitur Anglicando*. In introducing his own part in the new chapter which now begins in the life of this Journal, he is content to say, with the son of Sirach: "Ye are intreated therefore to read with favour and attention, and to pardon us, if in any parts of what we have laboured to interpret, we may seem to fail."

The policy of the Journal will be as before. It may be expressed by quoting another passage from the Introduction to *Lux Mundi*. "We have written not as 'guessers at truth,' but as servants of the Catholic Creed and Church, aiming only at interpreting the faith we have received. On the other hand, we have written with the conviction that the epoch in which we live is one of profound transformation, intellectual and social, abounding in new needs, new points of view, new questions: and certain therefore to involve great changes in the outlying departments of theology, where it is linked on to other sciences, and to necessitate some general restatement of its claims and meaning."

This stands. The actual problems of today are not exactly what they were. There is less obscurantism in the current defence of Christianity, there is more boldness in the attack. Theology, without having become less philosophical or less historical, has learned to present a more specifically Christian case. It has also learned to take account of psychology, and to analyze, in "the defence and confirmation of the Gospel," its own Catholic experience. The growth of the Anglo-Catholic Movement has affected the ethos of the Church. Whereas in 1889 an article on the *Epiklesis* would have appealed to few, today such an article helps to answer questions which everyone is asking. Whereas then Confession was a comparatively rare thing, and Reservation was unknown, today it is natural and inevitable that such topics should be discussed in such a magazine as this. Above all, we have begun to have a more tender social conscience and a larger social outlook. Our own pages are

rightly devoted to the consideration of questions of theology, but it is probable that the work of the St. Pancras Housing Association, and of like projects in Manchester and elsewhere, do more for the credit of the Church in the eyes of the people than many books.

All this, and much more than this, has come to pass among us, but the aim remains. Christian theology has been taking, and, as Charles Gore said forty-four years ago, must still go on taking "a new development." The degree of its essential continuity will be the measure of the soundness of our faith. The degree of its ultimate success will depend upon our love of that which Maurice called "not what I trow, or what thou trowest, or what he troweth, but that which lies at the bottom of all our throwings, the very Truth itself." A Journal of Historic Christianity is wedded to "the truth as it is in Jesus." It must love that truth, honour and keep her in sickness and in health, and, forsaking all other, keep only unto her.

Elsewhere we print a valuable review of *Northern Catholicism*. We do this most willingly. The judgment of a competent reviewer, who is moreover one of a considerable group, is always to be desired. The incisive criticisms of Mr. Beaumont James on Dr. Williams' theory of Catholic authority will be read with great interest. We venture to suggest that they should be read, if possible, with the original document at hand. This will have the effect of qualifying the validity of the sentence passed. For example, the "bland assumption," recurring in a "worse" form later, will be found to be confessedly based on the Synoptic Gospels, and to be itself no more than belief in the existence by the will of Christ of a Christian society. The word "reasonable" is said to occur with monotonous regularity, and to cover undemonstrated hypotheses. Five instances are referred to. A verification of these will disclose the fact that one is to the effect that the Church is the authoritative commentator on Holy Scripture, two say that a high doctrine of the Eucharist was characteristic of the undivided Church, one that the apparent Receptionism of St. Augustine in one context is not characteristic, and one that Unction has "a unique prestige." In any case, why not be reasonable? And if the use of reason leads to conclusions such as these, a critic who is led by the (presumably) non-rational methods which are at his own disposal to the same conclusions, might be expected to be glad that even reason has come into line.

The real fact is that Mr. Beaumont James does not like the interpretation put upon the Vincentian Canon, and the view taken of the Church. That the view taken is in the main Cyprianic and Augustinian, that "it seems to correspond both to the analogies offered by biological science and the actual facts of the Christian world," that it is peculiarly compatible with the necessity of doing justice to the Churches of the East, a part of Christendom which he does not mention—these things do not impress him. He wants something neater. In point of fact it seems a curious thing for him to want. "Master, speak to my brothers, that they agree to assign to our eldest brother the entire inheritance. Then all of us can become his tenants, on his terms." He demands just that precision which facts so seldom warrant. And he is afraid where no fear need exist. "This," he exclaims, "includes the Presbyterians." All that his author has said is that there were presbyter-bishops in the New Testament, and that there is a view of ministerial authority by which Episcopacy and Presbyterianism stand on one side and Congregationalism on the other. What seems to him an "extraordinary position" is that episcopal order, while it is to be required as a strict condition of Church Fellowship, stands on a lower level than belief in the Trinity and the Incarnation. Another of his apprehensions sounds more serious, but we have been unable to identify the passage where Dr. Williams says that "unity based upon the presbyterate (*i.e.*, upon the succession), though doubtful, is sufficiently established to justify its being taught as truth." Finally, he commits himself to the statement that the double sense in which Dr. Williams finds himself driven to use the word "Church" is neither more nor less than "Reunion All Round," as it was satirized by Father Ronald Knox. Our own conclusion is that it was entirely wholesome that Mr. Beaumont James should state his case frankly; but, if that is all that can be said against Dr. Williams' essay, it is not much.

Professor Grensted's volume on *The Person of Christ*, which gives us, at its best, the theology of the Group Movement, will be reviewed in our pages in due course on the scale which it deserves. Meantime two little books have reached us, *What is the Oxford Group?* by the Layman with a Notebook (Humphrey Milford, 2s. 6d.), and *The Challenge of the Oxford Groups*, by the Rev. S. A. King (Allenson, 1s. 6d.), which seem to require an editorial comment. No attempt is made in either of them to justify the use of the word "Oxford," against which the President of Magdalen has very reasonably protested as

an example of smart "salesmanship." Apart from that, the books are interesting, and the Movement is undoubtedly important. The most significant thing in the Layman's book is the sentence, "It would be idle of us to pretend that everybody needs to Share in order to live a real Christian life." This, if it is, so to speak, official, is a vital concession. The difficulty about the whole movement was not its occasional extravagances, or its lapses into bad taste and dangerous "exhibitionism." Those can be remedied, and perhaps have been remedied already. The real peril was that of spiritual arrogance, of posing as the only way: "We are the people, and wisdom will die with us." Whatever else is right, that is always wrong. If the movement is modified and liberalized in that direction, it will do much. It does not, as a rule, commend itself to the middle-aged. It is not their tradition. But the young are accustomed in these days to discuss many things with a frankness which to older people seems surprising. The Group method gives them an opportunity of discussing their own spiritual history and prospects with an equal frankness. Mr. Desmond Macarthy tells us, *apropos* of the bearing of poetry on life, that the young demand above all things that you should be serious. If they think that you care about it, they will listen to you. Thus there are many young people to whom the Group Movement seems "the real thing." If that were meant to imply the sum total of reality, then, as we have said, it would be an idle and sinful boast. But if it is not so, then a movement which has among its watchwords Surrender, Guidance, Restitution is at least not far from the strait gate and narrow way which lead to life. Shall we not say *Dominus vobiscum*?

IS THERE A CHRISTIAN APOLOGETIC?

I.—INTRODUCTORY

MAN, who has been defined as a rational animal, is only partly so, only by way of becoming rational, often irrational through fear or laziness or immaturity, never wholly and sustainedly rational. And Man, defined as a tool-making and tool-using animal, is only partly so, for he only makes and uses tools to subserve ends immediate or remote, practical or speculative, and his interest is in those ends rather than in the tools, which wear out and fail to meet his growing desires unless altered and improved. And Man defined as a humorous animal does not always laugh. Capable of laughter though he be, he "looks before and after and pines for what is not"; his first gift to his children is a gift of tears. Man weeps and in his weeping betrays his dissatisfaction with the imperfection of his thought, the imperfection of his tools, and the inadequacy of his laughter. For, "moving about in worlds not realized," and "swinging wicket-set between the Unseen and the seen," Man, because he is more than a maker of tools, more than a maker of intellectual systems and series, Man, the poet, is "of Imagination all compact": he is "incurably religious." Try as he will to make himself at home in his world, he knows that he is never quite at home therein, knows himself to be a solitary, to be alone even in the midst of a crowd, knows and yet does not know what to do with his solitariness, knows that though solitary and alone he is not so alone as to be wholly isolated from that Other scarcely descried, falteringly discerned and only daringly named a thousand names, knows that to that Other he owes his being, to that Other must render an account, to that Other must return, home at last. Yes, Man is incurably religious:*

"I fled Him, down the nights and down the days;
I fled Him, down the arches of the years;
I fled Him, down the labyrinthine ways
Of my own mind; and in the mist of tears
I hid from Him, and under running laughter.
Up vistaed hopes I sped;
And shot, precipitated,
Adown Titanic glooms of chasmed fears,
From those strong Feet that followed, followed after.
But with unhurrying chase,
And unperturbed pace,
Deliberate speed, majestic instancy,
They beat—and a Voice beat
More instant than the Feet—
'All things betray thee, who betrayest Me.'"

* See A. C. Bouquet's criticism of this phrase, *Is Christianity the Final Religion?* p. 28.

This being so, for religion as such, for his attempts to do somewhat with his solitariness, for his ceaseless efforts "so to pass through things temporal that he fail not finally to reach things eternal," Man needs no apology. For his religious practices justification, excuse, extenuation or apology, and forgiveness may all be needed: for his religious principles exposition, interpretation, apologetic in the strict sense of the term will be required: but for Man's pursuit of religion as the necessary fulfilment (however imperfectly realized) of his whole essential being and nature, no apology is required. It is true that there are those today, like Bertrand Russell, who, looking too curiously into the details of religious history, and overlooking the inevitability of religion for the individual, regard it as a foe to be fought, as "dope" to be discarded, a fear to be silenced for ever. But such criticisms are rather applicable to particular religions and (as we should hold) to serious misconceptions and misinterpretations thereof and not to religion as such. Those who make them are indeed compelled by the law of their own being to fashion new altars for those thrown down, and to invent a free man's worship to replace that of those supposed to be slaves.*

Where, then, is the need for apologetic? Does it not lie in the fact of religious history; in the rivalry of competing historical religions, in the claims of science, of philosophy, of ethics, of æsthetics, of humanitarianism, to provide a substitute, a better alternative for a given religion? The challenge made by any great historical religion is so imperious, so compelling, so far-reaching in its consequences, that Man's very respect for Truth, for the loyalty he is asked to give, is such that he will only accept and give that loyalty with all the consequences it involves, if not only his moral and emotional nature is satisfied, but also his intellect, however intermittently it may function. Indeed, the very existence of apologetic is itself a tribute to the religion which produces it. A religion which failed to produce an apologetic has failed to attract the intellect of Man, has failed to grow from childhood into manhood. That apologetic is the offering of the intellect to a Truth which it thereby confesses is greater than it knows. As only an earth rich in flower and herb and tree could evoke a botany, as only a sky incredibly rich in heavenly splendours could evoke an astronomy, so only a religion of surpassing worth and truth could evoke the splendid achievements of Christian theology and apologetic. An impoverished religion can call forth no apologetic.

* Cf. C. C. J. Webb, *Problems in the Relations of God and Man*, pp. 3 ff.

II

There is, then, a Christian apologetic because there is an historical Christianity emerging in Time and continuing in Time. Confronting both the Jewish world from which it sprang and the Gentile world into which it was to go, the new religion with its news, claiming to be good news, to be the news of most import to men, challenged the prevalent behaviour of both Jew and Gentile; challenged their prevalent modes of thought, and offered new satisfactions to feeling. It could not but be that the Gospel should provoke counter-attacks and that therefore considered defences should become necessary. Hence St. Peter is concerned in his first essay in apologetic to shew that he and his company are not full of new wine, but are of seemly behaviour, though spiritually transformed. St. Paul, on the other hand, is equally concerned to vindicate to the intelligentsia of Athens that the god whom they ignorantly worship is none other than Jesus and that this Jesus had been raised from the dead, while to the Corinthians his apologetic is concerned rather with right feeling than with right thought.

It is, however, no part of our task to detail the long history of apologetic. It must suffice to note that throughout that history the intellectual warfare is waged on many fronts: now it is the doctrine of the Person of Christ which has to be consolidated; anon the exact nature of the appeal to miracle or to prophecy: or it is the vindication of the character and authenticity of the primary texts of Christianity: or it is the Christian interpretation of history. But although the main battle varies from age to age, and although auxiliary actions are as it were fought on many different fronts, always we may say, *where the original impact was, there the battle returns*. "This same Jesus": "What think ye of Christ?" In what sense, if any, are we to attribute finality to Christ and to Christianity? It might indeed be said, and in a real sense truly, that Christ is His own apology: "Which of you convicteth me of sin?" that before His august presence the criticism of sinful men with their erring wills and their intellectual pride is necessarily itself answered, rebuked and silenced. But today this is not wholly so. Today, the very character and personality of the Carpenter's Son of Nazareth are subject to criticism as never before, even, for instance, in the fine pages of Dr. Montefiore. Once again, where the original impact was there the battle returns, and today there are those who in all sobriety ask whether Christianity is not doomed to pass away, or at least must abandon its claims to finality and accept a lower though still honourable place among other great and satisfying religions.

As, then, in the first two centuries it was Christian behaviour which evoked the vindications of apology, so that a Tertullian is constrained to maintain that the lives of Christians deserve praise, not blame, and that persecution is ineffectual against such lives, seeing that the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church, so in our own day Christian apologetic against paganism in its modern subtler forms must include the vindication of the Christian ethic. This recurrent need is with us the more urgent by reason of the wide extension of popular education and of scientific knowledge and its applications, together with considerations of economics in relation to problems of personal ethics in directions hitherto regarded as definitely settled. The marked uneasiness and even uncertainty of much recent Christian ethics in such matters indicates how permanent and necessary a task it is for apologetics to vindicate the principles and practice of Christian morality. It must be admitted, with Dr. Barry, that "incomparably the most imperious challenge which today confronts Christianity is the moral chaos of our generation . . . no doubt thousands of men and women are bewildered about the Christian creed . . . but there is another question far more summary, which the whole world is asking daily, and it is calling aloud for a decisive answer. In its simplest terms the question is, 'Why shouldn't I?'" Apologetic in such a field therefore becomes part of the apparatus of conversion, although it is no part of the apologist's duty or task to convert or to save souls. This he must leave to God's grace; his own task, and it is a high one, is to convince. It is God's task through God's love to constrain. Thus St. Paul's apology to Philemon sets before the slave-owner the general terms upon which the solution of the problem of slavery from the Christian standpoint may be founded. That Epistle was not out of date when the issue recurred in Great Britain in 1833 or in the American Civil War in 1861-1865. Similarly, Paul's letters to the Corinthians provide materials for the Christian apologetic in the matter of sexual ethics which are needed as much today as then, and, although the details would differ, it is not difficult to conceive the characteristics and lines upon which a Pauline Epistle would be written to Dean Inge, Mr. Walter Lippmann, Bertrand Russell or H. G. Wells.

It may be said that it is not usual to include Christian ethics so directly within the survey of apologetics. There is an answer, however, to such criticism. In the first place, any historical religion makes its prime and original appeal to men through what its founder does, and through what he requires them to do. Although religion is never to be identified and found coincident with morality, yet the fact remains that it must

always have repercussions upon morality: it must ever be a way of living as well as a way of thinking. The burden of much of our Lord's teaching is the fulfilment of the Old Law and its transformation in, or supersession by, the New. The lawyer had read the Law aright, but, being willing to justify himself, proposes a problem in ethics, and receives a new lesson in neighbourliness. The rich young man has kept the Law from his youth up, and is bidden learn that "man was made to grow and not to stop"; to learn so hard a lesson in renunciation and sacrifice that he went away sorrowful. That is to say, in these cases the apologia of Jesus to the critics of His own day was not a doctrine in divinity, but a salutary lesson in conduct.*

In the second place, it is precisely in matters of conduct that modern Christianity is most criticized and most in need of constructive apologetic. Whether that apologetic should be of the somewhat compromising and accommodating character of Dr. Barry's recent book, or the less compromising and more convincing character of the defence of Christianity as absolute given in Dr. Bouquet's work *Is Christianity the Final Religion?* is not our present business. The point is that no less than in its intellectual implications, it is in its ethical consequences that Christianity makes a perennial challenge and needs a perennial apologetic. What had to be done in the first two centuries to cleanse a world which lay bound in wickedness, has to be done afresh age by age, and not less in our own. "There is actually not much difference," says Bouquet, "between the evolutionist ethics of a Bolshevik republic and the pagan ethics of a well-governed, well-organized province of the Roman Empire."

III

But religion is more than a way of living.† It is a way of thinking, and the Roman world lay not only in wickedness but also in darkness and knew not God. Hence apologetic turns its attention from the vindication of Christian conduct to the defence of Christian thought. The consolidation of the spiritual experience gained in the new religion necessarily led to its articulation and discrimination in doctrinal terms within the fold. Hence attack similarly shifts from Christian conduct to Christian doctrine, documents, and creed. Apologetic assumes a philosophical character which it has never lost. As education spreads and science advances this must increasingly be its permanent character. Hence it is that an Augustine and an Aquinas are concerned to claim that theology is the

* See also Newsom's *The New Morality*.

† See Crawley, *The Tree of Life*, c. vi. et seq.

queen of sciences, that Plato's Republic finds its crown in the *Civitas Dei*, and that Christianity provides a reasonable, the most reasonable, and indeed the final world-view and philosophy of history. Such apologetics, like its ethical counterpart, must derive from the New Testament, and once again have for its ultimate goal the vindication of "this same Jesus." "God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son who is the brightness of His glory and the express image of His person." "And we beheld His glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." Out of this impact of philosophy upon Christian experience arose not only the great doctrinal formulations of the Councils, and the later great syntheses of the scholastic system, but also the clear formulation of the previous question of all theology, of God and His existence; and it is noteworthy that this question, giving birth to the ontological argument, and the later articulation of the Three Proof system, arises within the Christian fold. It is Anselm, saint and archbishop, who first clearly formulates the *a priori* argument.

The problem shifts in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which in the Deism of a Herbert of Cherbury anticipated the modern advocacy of religion without revelation. The apologetic of revealed religion thence employs in Bishop Butler and Paley that method of analogy which continues to characterize the Christian philosophy of a William Temple in the twentieth century. To the form of that type of apology we shall presently return.

The task of modern apologetics, however, has been considerably extended by other developments. It was apparent at the close of the eighteenth century that Kant's destructive critique of all "Rational Theology" would necessitate a revision of the whole basis of theism and revealed religion, and would call for a fresh handling of the problem of the essential nature of religion itself. If, from the standpoint of the Kantian criticism, religion was merely an auxiliary to ethics, and, although a practical certitude of the spirit arising from the implications of the moral law, had no constitutive but only regulative force, then not only were ritual, prayer, penance, joy, reconciliation and redemption very difficult to establish, but the whole structure of institutional religion was threatened and in need of vindication. Nor could much comfort be found in the Hegelian view that, since the essence of spirit is thought, religion has for its content the unity of Absolute with finite spirit, and has only propædæutic value as a prelude to philosophy for those unable to attain the higher levels of thought: a position not dissimilar

from that taken up by Croce today. Such neglect of feeling was met by Schleiermacher's definition of religion as "feeling of dependence," which not only did justice to the emotional factor but also provided a way of bringing æsthetic experience into recognition in religion. Nevertheless, Schleiermacher's stress on feeling brought other problems in its train. If God is only to be found in feeling, what is to become of the objectivity of religion? And if in the experience of dependence alone man has religion and finds God, what status is to be assigned to personality? From this time onwards, then, throughout the nineteenth century and continuing to our own day, the problem of religious philosophy has been viewed as turning more and more upon value-judgments and on personality, its adjectival or substantival status. We need not do more here than cite the Gifford Lectures of James Ward, of Bosanquet, of Webb, of Pringle-Pattison, of Sorley, of A. E. Taylor, and of the posthumous work of von Hügel: all bespeak that "Quest for Certainty" which gives the title to Dewey's own Gifford series. The shadow of subjectivity lies heavy on our modern apologetic. Only with difficulty do these apologists recover the sunshine of objectivity.

But it is not only these problems which have affected the modern treatment of our subject. Closely allied to the question of value-judgments and personality are the fields of psychology, anthropology,* and comparative religion. The apologist today has to meet such criticism as that religion is grounded in fear and must inevitably disappear as men cease to be cowards: that prayer is only auto-suggestion, and while possessing value for mental health, entirely lacks validity and objective response: that Christianity, far from being the absolute religion, is at its worst a mere *réchauffé* of older religions, or at its best one amongst other world religions not inferior in suitability to their own peculiar environment. The voluminous results of anthropology and comparative religion similarly threaten to overthrow the faith once delivered to the saints, and the apologist has therefore to meet attack with counter-attack and to question, in his turn, whether the essence of religion can be arrived at from anthropological or etymological studies alone. Sooner or later the apologist must maintain the revelational and historical character of Christianity and a revelational character in individual religious experience. Some independent mark of religion and religious experience has to be sought, and in our day this has been referred by Otto to a specific numinous feeling in relation to the *mysterium tremendum*. The apologist notes that Man frames value-judgments, and he is invited by Otto to find in

* See Taylor, Frazer, Marett, Crawley, Schmidt, etc.

the value-judgments arising from the experience of the numinous the specific mark of religion. "Wonder is religion's dearest child." There is that in personality which craves for the sustenance which the *mysterium tremendum* alone can give: "Tu fecisti nos ad Te, et inquietum est cor nostrum donec requiescat in Te." Attack and apology therefore develop in the grand manner from Kant and his successors to our own day, in which the work of Troeltsch, Temple, Hocking, Webb, Galloway, D'Arcy, and Taylor forms with the Hulsean and Gifford Lectures a continuous apologetic. Nor is this all. Peculiar to modern apologetics is the intimacy of the reaction between theology and science.*

IV

The rapid development of the physical sciences during the nineteenth century and the striking triumphs of experimental methods in research and discovery in the physical order brought about a series of heavy attacks upon not only the miraculous elements in Christianity, but also upon its theistic and personalistic presuppositions. The claims and data of evolution seemed to weaken if not wholly to discredit the argument from design and to strengthen the agnosticism to which fine minds such as T. H. Huxley adhered. It was not until the publication of James Ward's massive volumes on *Naturalism and Agnosticism* at the beginning of this century that religious apologetic found the answer and could lift up its head. Similarly, mechanistic views of the natural order held such sway that there seemed to be no room for freedom in the individual any more than in Nature itself, and although Ward's second work, *The Realm of Ends*, cogently stated the case against extending the supposed mechanics of causation from a limited and closed system to a free and open universe, it was necessary for a Bergson in his *Creative Evolution*, and for Driesch in his *Philosophy of the Organism*, to carry the warfare into the enemy's camp and to shew that a mechanical and rigid uniformity was not the sole characteristic of the physical universe, and that within the field of the data of evolution there was evidence of new creative factors, so that today vitalism has come to stay in biology, and emergent evolution in the philosophy of science. The importance of this for the apologist is very great. He notes with gratitude, but without surprise, that the modern physicist like Eddington can use the word "creation" without a tremor and can strongly say: "Not once in the dim past, but continuously by conscious Mind is the miracle of creation wrought."

* See Bertrand Russell's *Why I am not a Christian*.

And the same physicist, in shewing that physics is no longer pledged to determinism, can even say, "The earth goes anywhere it pleases"; and aver that the year 1927, which saw the enunciation of the Principle of Indeterminacy, is epoch-making for the world's thought. So Eddington continues, "Science withdraws its moral opposition to freedom." A great change has thus come over physical science in its reactions upon theology and philosophy. The concept of causation itself is criticized by those who use it, and the advocates of a spiritual view of the universe are bidden to go on their way in their own independent sphere untroubled and rejoicing. A spiritual realism can thus be defended as a truer interpretation of the world than is naturalism or scientific monism. For "substances" Ward would use the term "souls," and thus stress activity as the prime mark of individuality. Such spiritual realism will enable the apologist to make room for freedom and personality, and to apply that same term personality, though cautiously, to the Divine Being in its interior and exterior relationships. Thus Professor Webb will use the term, provided we speak not of the personality of God, but of the personality in God: where von Hügel prefers to speak of God as personal but not as person. So important are prepositions and adjectives.

There remains, however, for the apologist a different and not less important and permanent problem; one more intractable and difficult—viz., the mystery of pain. That problem has been accentuated for us once again by our fuller knowledge of the extent and scope of animal suffering (it is even averred to extend to plant life); by the similarly large extension of human suffering in the shared suffering engendered by our modern economic and industrial conditions; by the uneven distribution of happiness in the individual; and by the problem of world-wide and catastrophic war. It is perhaps since the Great War that suffering has most engaged the attention of the *defensores fidei*, and the traditional doctrine of the impassibility of God has been largely abandoned—e.g., by Temple, Matthews, and others; though how suffering as a problem is reduced by adding one more to the number of those who suffer has perhaps not been satisfactorily explained. The traditional doctrine and Chalcedonian position find a staunch defender in von Hügel.

The tensions in apologetics to which we have been referring as brought about by the scientific progress of the last hundred years, are reflected in a striking way in the poetry of the era. The difference is very great between Milton in the seventeenth century justifying the ways of God to men through the medium of a hard and rigidly conceived theological system, however

magnificently expressed in his epic, and Tennyson and Browning in the nineteenth century, wrestling with the problems of suffering, of immortality, of the Incarnation itself; while the aftermath of the apologetic war is found in Bridges' monumental work, dealing not with "a death in the desert" nor with "the higher pantheism," but with the way, the testament of beauty. Tennyson, standing at the threshold of the Darwinian epoch, can write, perhaps a little wistfully:

"We have but faith; we cannot know;
For knowledge is of things we see;
And yet we trust it comes from Thee—
A beam in darkness; let it grow.

"Let knowledge grow from more to more,
But more of reverence in us dwell;
That mind and soul, according well,
May make one music as before,

"But vaster. We are fools and slight;
We mock thee when we do not fear;
But help thy foolish ones to bear:
Help thy vain worlds to bear thy light."

Browning, on the other hand, a little later, with a keener eye for particular problems and perhaps a greater dialectical power, can add as a postscript to one of his greatest poems:

"The very God. Think, Abib, dost thou think?
So, the All-Great were the All-Loving too.
So, through the thunder comes a human voice
Saying, 'O heart I made, a heart beats here;
Face My hands fashioned, see it in Myself.
Thou hast no power, nor mayest conceive of Mine,
But love I gave thee, with Myself to love,
And thou must love Me Who have died for thee!'"

V

But of late the finality of the Christian religion has been disputed even by some of its eminent apologists and defenders—*e.g.*, Troeltsch. In his earlier work Troeltsch had adopted a generous position with regard to the institutional and traditional elements in Christianity; but he had always been similarly appreciative of the values expressed in other world-religions, and in his latest lectures he advanced the concept of polymorphous truth, in which he stressed not only the likenesses but more the differences between the various religions and between Catholic and Protestant Christianity. He therefore proceeded to conclude that the Christian religion, far from being wholly universal and final, is too deeply rooted in those circumstances of time and place which gave it birth and which have witnessed its own history ever to flourish in a different environ-

ment. He had earlier rejected the old apologetic of Methodism and Pietism, and any reliance upon miracle. So, too, he rejected the Hegelian view that Christianity as the crowning phase of all religions was not so much a particular religion as religion itself. He averred that individuality, infinitely diverse and variously emerging (the characteristic concept of Romanticism), must be accepted as applicable to religion, and he therefore found it difficult in his last writings to reconcile the claims of individuality with those of the absolute validity and finality of Christianity. He regarded the witness of inner experience as not less strong in other religions than in Christianity, and the supposed underlying Christian basis of other faiths Troeltsch described as singularly slight, irrelevant, and material rather than spiritual. The ominous consequence for him, therefore, was that while Christian missions were relevant in the heathen field and had a unique value there, they could have no similar claim upon the attention of the Jew, Moslem or Hindu, whose share of polymorphous truth was valid for them. His last word, then, is that an absolutely valid, absolutely final religion is yet to seek.

The relativity doctrine in modern science and philosophy seems to re-enforce Troeltsch's position, and even a Catholic poet can say:

"There is no expeditious road
To pack and label men for God
And save them by the barrel-load;
Some may, perchance, with glad surprise,
Have blundered into Paradise."

There is no space here to consider fully the position thus taken up, but we must note in passing that the recent attempt by Dr. Matthews, the Dean of Exeter, is in substance and method that of Archbishop Temple—i.e., use is made of the æsthetic analogy. To his dialectical contention that relativity itself can only be conceived and is meaningless except in reference to that which is final, and that the defender of the thesis that all truth is relative implies that he has at least one absolute truth in his possession (viz., the thesis he advances), Matthews adds the further suggestion that in the field of æsthetic experience, in æsthetic creation in great music, great poetry, great art, we are continually confronted with an irruption in Time of that which is everywhere recognized as absolutely satisfying, universal in quality and final. Finality, absoluteness, is what meets us in the authentic Shakespeare, the authentic Beethoven, the authentic Michael Angelo. There is a revelational quality about their work which cannot be gainsaid; particularly is this so in music:

"But here is the finger of God, a flash of the Will that can!
 Existent behind all laws, that made them, and lo, they are:
 And I know not if, save in this, such gift be allowed to man
 That out of three sounds he frame, not a fourth sound, but a star."

If, then, through the medium of æsthetic achievement and experience we find what is absolutely final and of absolute value irrupting from the Eternal into Time and Space, why should not the Absolute and Final Value Himself make irruption into our world; why should there not be a Person who expresses absolute and final value on the Cross? So runs Dr. Matthews' argument, and it is cited here because of the growing significance for modern apologetic of the argument from æsthetic. Whether that argument can be ultimately sustained, and if so, in what forms and under what conditions, must be examined later.* But before passing to some consideration of the type of apologetic presented in Archbishop Temple's works, one passage from Bridges' Testament of Beauty bearing on the matter of this section may be quoted:

"Verily it is by Beauty that we come at WISDOM,
 yet not by Reason at Beauty. . . .
 This is the rife Idea whose spiritual beauty
 multiplieth in communion to transcendant might.
 This is thatt excelent way whereon if we wil walk
 all things shall be added unto us."

VI

A. If we now select Dr. Temple's essay for some consideration, it is not because *Mens Creatrix* is necessarily the best current apology for Christianity. It is chosen because the method adopted seems to me to express very faithfully the main trend of current thought and because it provides much that is stimulating and helpful to the pastor and teacher of philosophy and religion. Indicative of the great use made of modern æsthetic experience and reliance upon the intuitions of the poets is his acknowledgment that the three master-influences in his own thought are St. John, Plato and Browning (all three, it may be noted, poet-philosophers). He does not, like St. Anselm, open his enquiry with prayer, but a noble prayer closes the argument. Nor does he, like his great predecessor, confine himself to one main issue—the problem raised by the *insipiens* who said: "There is no God." Rather, Dr. Temple proposes a general survey of Mind's activity in four main departments, in three of which—viz., Knowledge, Art and Conduct—he will shew the results to be, though great in value, so finally inadequate and unsatisfying as to require for their

* Von Hügel's posthumous opus, *The Reality of God*, contains many passages unexpectedly accepting the æsthetic analogy.

completion the hypothesis offered in religion and in particular in the Christian religion, the fourth department of our activity. He is, however, careful to insist that the progressive systematization of our experience as we apprehend it is not a formal passage and process from Universals to Universals, or from Particulars to Universals, or from Particulars to Particulars, but is rather a complete experience in itself in which these constituents occur, analyzable indeed, but not separable in reality. Hence he will "count not himself to have apprehended"; always a great part escapes us.

Since, however, knowledge is one of the good things of the world, and its value lies in its relation to individual persons and its achievement as one of the deliberate works of creative mind, Dr. Temple proceeds to examine the instrument which Reason has fashioned in order somewhat to apprehend. That instrument is Logic, and the procedure of Logic must hence be subject to criticism. He finds it incomplete and inadequate. The intellect can never fully grasp its own subject-matter; its method of abstraction compels it for ever to be restless, and it must therefore turn to Art, which is essentially at rest, to find the natural culmination of Science. Scientific Truth, therefore, is not the whole truth about Reality. The intellect in its operations finds "in contradiction at once its enemy and yet its stimulus. . . . Contradiction is what it cannot think, and yet contradiction is what makes it think." (The point had been made some years earlier by the French psychologist Paulhan). So, "by the perpetual discovery of new contradictions it is forced to a more and more systematic apprehension." The intellect, indeed, is ever seeking a Truth which shall emancipate us from our bondage to Time; it seeks to approximate its results to Mathematics, where escape from Time is secured by the non-temporal character of the mathematical objects it investigates. Nevertheless, the Truth secured by the intellect never does give the self the desired mastery over Time. That mastery can only be secured by Imagination. It is Imagination, "Reason in her most exalted mood," as Wordsworth calls it, which through Art transfigures, transforms and transvalues Science. Art is thus superior in product to Science. Intellect, then, is found by Dr. Temple to be inadequate and unsatisfying. It may lead us to the notion of a Society of Intelligences, but it cannot and does not lead us to the transcendent God which religion and the heart both require. The unique, the irreplaceable individual, as man finite, as God infinite, can never be adequately seized by the intellect, but only by the self-conscious, ethical, æsthetic spirit of man. The intellect, doomed restlessly and ceaselessly to ask "Why?" and to seek escape from the

temporal, must invoke the aid of Imagination to provide more satisfying wholes of experience than the systems of the intellect. He quotes a familiar passage from *Bishop Blougram's Apology*:

"Just when we're safest, comes a sunset touch,
A fancy from a flower-bell, someone's death,
A chorus ending from Euripides;
And that's enough for fifty hopes and fears
As old and new at once as Nature's self,
To rap and knock and enter in our soul,
Take hands, and dance there, in fantastic ring,
Round the ancient idol, on his base again—
The grand Perhaps! We look on helplessly."

B. Can, then, the soul's quest be satisfied in Art? This constitutes the next stage in the essay. Again and again, citing the poets, chiefly Shakespeare, Wordsworth and Browning, he emphasizes the timelessness of our experience of beauty. In æsthetic experience there is, in Browning's words, "no more near nor far."* He finds support in Royce's use of the *Ancient Mariner* to illustrate the spirit of mysticism, and under the influence of the æsthetic doctrines of Hegel and Benedetto Croce, he applies the theory that beauty is expression to maintain that the proper function of Art is to create essential symbols. This train of thought he develops in a close discussion of the significance of tragedy. From the spectacle of suffering presented by tragedy, from the impression of waste, of nobility and worthwhileness in the atonement which tragedy makes, he deduces with Bradley that tragedy is itself an overwhelming witness to the environment of the Eternal, to our continuing contact with a Reality "vast and solemn which speaks through sufferers but is more than they." The world thus revealed by tragedy is a world which truly symbolizes in its unconquerable reactions to suffering and evil the eternal order. The philosophy of tragedy is not the last word of human philosophy, but, he adds, "No philosophy can by any possibility be true which does not contain the truth symbolized by tragedy, that the world is a noble world, terrible, pitiable, and sad beyond belief, but exalted in its sad solemnity: we would not alter it though we cannot be content with it." Archbishop Temple therefore finds more in the dark doom of human life than the austere stoicism which is all that Earl Russell can offer us in the free man's worship.

Nevertheless, just because æsthetic experience only reaches its climax when it is at the point of passing into worship, Art is no final alternative to or substitute for religion. Science and Art both propound the hypothesis that the supreme principle of the universe must be adequately embodied, take form, be

* Cf. von Hügel; *The Reality of God*.

incarnate; but they do more. Hypothesis is not enough. The finality which Dr. Matthews finds in great Art is not for Dr. Temple a safe conclusion.

C. Does, then, Ethics do more? Yes; it continues and advances the movement of mind in the escape from Time. In purposive life, in the ethical imperative, we rise still nearer to the realization of the non-temporal, of the eternal. We are not here concerned to press too closely the question as to what exactly this transcendence of Time is to be construed as meaning, nor whether our author takes Time seriously enough. Our present purpose is to note the advance of his argument from Science through Art, and through Ethics to Religion. He points out the absence in Plato of any doctrine of development, and the failure to appreciate sacrifice. He therefore himself argues that the ethical problem is a social problem, and he addresses himself to this thesis in important chapters on education and internationalism. Nevertheless, ethics alone is powerless to save the nations from internecine strife, and the remedy for war is to be found in that realization of a *regnum Dei* which Christianity, rightly understood and applied, alone makes possible. So he moves toward his conclusion. Where Science fails because it is exclusively intellectual, Art fails because it is exclusively emotional and Ethics fails because it is too volitional. It is the whole man that needs emancipation from time; the whole man in his whole personality that seeks salvation. That salvation and redemption are to be found in religion alone, and particularly in the Christian religion.

D. Dr. Temple now proceeds to argue that religion is the culmination of Science, Art, and Morality. The mind, however, demands more than the hypotheses provided in these fields. "It demands that its ideals be actualized. Man's creative mind can find satisfaction only if there be a Divine creative Mind with which it may have communion." Herein religion transcends philosophy, which cannot provide such communion. He parts company with Kant and Hegel at this point. Philosophy, for all its tendency to theism as the ultimate basis of a reasonable world, can get no further than the proposition that "God is the ground of the possibility of all certainty." It cannot possibly by itself refute ultimate scepticism. So also, religious experience by itself is powerless to convince him who has it not. Only the combination of philosophical and religious values can, he thinks, provide an almost complete basis for belief. "Almost complete," for the problem of evil has yet to be considered and will always be found intractable. We need not, however, follow further his argument on this matter, except to note his Hegelian conclusion that "a sinful

world redeemed by the agony of Love's complete self-sacrifice is a world that is better than one that never sinned."

Does, then, history reveal such an act of Love's complete self-sacrifice? Does history provide in any specific event a new start for man? The Christian answer is Yes. It is in the events of the Gospel story that the new start is to be found, and in the Cross the finality of Christ (to use Dr. Matthews' phrase) is decisively shewn. The climax of Dr. Temple's apologetic, therefore, is that the Christian Gospel alone provides the final consummation of Science, Morality, and Art. Without that story, intellect, will, and feeling go hopelessly adrift. With it, the rare achievements of all three are ratified, justified, and satisfied. The New Testament provides sufficient evidence ("evidence as good as it is desirable it should be," are his significant words) that "God has actually wrought precisely what man needs." The creative mind in man never attains its goal until the creative mind of God completes man's work. Previous history in a sense constituted a *præparatio evangelica*, but in reality Christ's advent was a genuinely new start, not to be wholly accounted for by previous history. God transcendent broke through history. This line of thought, the intrusion of the Eternal, will be met with again in a more recent apologia, Professor Taylor's *Faith of a Moralist*. Absolute power and absolute love combined are needed for the world's needs: the combination is found, as Kharshish tells Abib he found it, in *Christus Consummator*; the All-Great is the All-Loving too.

VII

That there are loose strands, weak points in the argument of *Mens Creatrix* and *Christus Veritas* we may readily concede, but these do not detract from the value of their author's apologetic. It is a synthetic method, a constructive method, a method appealing consistently to the whole personality and not to intellect or will or feeling taken separately. It is a method which uses but is not mastered by the current concepts of modern philosophy such as value-judgments; and it is a method which, analogical though it be, keeps steadily in the centre of the picture that which is of supreme interest: "This same Jesus." It is the apologetic of a religion which is not the religion of a book but of a Person. It is an apologetic which accepts all that Philosophy and Science can give, but denies that the intellect can give us the whole truth, or final truth, or saving truth.

Christus Consummator, this same Jesus; the apologist can never with safety stray far from his central interest, the historic

Christ, and it is perhaps because of this need that the great apologist seems to be always accompanied by the great poet, prophet, seer, or saint. To an Aquinas there is the inspiration given by the second founder of Christianity, St. Francis of Assisi: to a Butler there is given in his generation a Wesley and the Olney hymns: against a Darwin, a Haeckel, or a Bertrand Russell may be set for the aid of the apologist a Curé d'Ars, a Father Damien, a William Booth, a Charles Gore, an Abbé Huvelin, a Mother Agnes Mason. To every attack Christianity replies not only with an apology and an apologist, but also with a martyr or a saint. Sanctity and song are never far away from the apologist, "to warn, to comfort and command"; never far away from this same Jesus.

Yes, there is a Christian apologetic. It is found in Christ Himself, the corner-stone and foundation; it is found in the glorious company of the apostles from St. Paul continuing unto this day; it is found in the noble army of martyrs continuing unto this day; it is found in the goodly fellowship of the prophets continuing unto this day; above all it is found in the "fellowship of the friendship of Christ." In the words of the *Testament of Beauty*, it is found wherever Man-soul makes glad escape from the dilemma of pagan thought in the worship of Christ:

"This is the rife Idea whose spiritual beauty
multiplieth in communion to transcendant might.
This is thatt excelent way whereon if we wil walk
all things shall be added unto us—thatt Love which inspired
the wayward Visionary in his doctrinal ode
to the three christian Graces, the Church's first hymn
and only deathless athanasian creed,—the which
'except a man believe he cannot be savèd.'
This is the endearing bond whereby Christ's company
yet holdeth together on the truth of his promise
that he spake of his great pity and trust in man's love,
Lo, I am with you always ev'n to the end of the world.
Truly the Soul returneth the body's loving
where it hath won it . . . and God so loveth the world . . .
and in the fellowship of the friendship of Christ
God is seen as the very self-essence of love,
Creator and mover of all as activ Lover of all,
self-express'd in not-self, without which no self were
In thought whereof is neither beginning nor end
nor space nor time; nor any fault nor gap therein
'twixt self and non-self, mind and body, mother and child,
'twixt lover and loved, God and man: but ONE ETERNAL
in the love of Beauty and in the selfhood of Love."

ALBERT A. COCK.

THE LAMB OF GOD: CONCERNING THE GOD-MAN

THE LAMB OF GOD: CONCERNING THE GOD-MAN. By Rev. Sergius Bulgakov. Part I. Paris: Y.M.C.A. Press, 1933. Pp. 468. (In Russian.)

THE basic idea of the author's Christology is God-manhood—that is, the perfect union of Godhead and manhood in Christ; and, further still, of God and the world. In this sense his task is to construct a Chalcedonian theology. Hence his direction is equally opposed to pantheism and Protestant transcendentalism. The problem is Christological: How is the Incarnation possible? What does it presuppose and what does it comprise? The author begins with a wide patristic introduction. He finds the Christological problem first put in Apollinarius of Laodicea. After him the Alexandrian school (St. Cyril) and the Antiochian school (Theodore, Nestorius, etc., and, in a certain sense, Leo the Great) express dialectically both thesis and antithesis in the doctrine of unity and duality in the nature of Christ. This opposition is resolved by the synthesis of the Chalcedonian dogma concerning the duality of natures in one person. Nevertheless, this is only a dogmatic, and not a theological synthesis; the latter remains the quest of theology. The attempt of Leontius of Byzantium is a formalistic scholastic construction, bearing the impress of Aristotle, and cannot satisfy modern thought. St. John Damascene does not introduce new theological ideas into Christology but only sums up his predecessors. The monothelite and dithelite disputes, together with the definition of the Sixth Œcumenical Council, move in the plane of the former theology and do not advance Christological doctrine; they only give the Chalcedonian formula a more concrete expression relative to the duality, not only of natures, but of wills, leaving the question theologically obscure despite the works of St. Maxim the Confessor. At this point creative thought in the sphere of Christology breaks off, and the desired theological synthesis is left as the task of the future.

The basic question of Christology is how to understand the union of two natures, Divine and human, in the one person of the Logos, not only negatively, as in the four negatives of the Chalcedonian formula, but also positively. Not only what is the Chalcedonian negative, but what is the Chalcedonian positive? In his Christology the author deliberately and openly relies on Sophiology, the doctrine of the eternal and created Wisdom. The Holy Trinity has a nature or *οὐσία*, which is not only the inexhaustible depth of life but also the self-revelation

of the Godhead, and in this sense *οὐσία* is Sophia. Sophia is omni-unity, the fulness of the ideal forms of the Logos, to which belongs reality as Beauty in the Holy Spirit. She is the fulness of the Divine life and in this sense is the Divine world. As the self-revelation of Godhead she is not a person, but belongs to the Three Persons, is personalized; moreover, the Person directly addressed to Sophia is the Logos. The ideal *all* of the Logos is realized, and to that extent is made personal, by the Holy Spirit, and both Persons reveal the Father. Hence, in *οὐσία*, as Sophia, is realized the consubstantial and undivided life of the Holy Trinity. She is *ens realissimum*, as the Divine world possessing the eternity of God. She is the glory of God as the Divine blessedness in the tripersonal love of God to His own Godhead. Besides this she is pre-eternal Manhood as the prototype, in the form of which man is created, and the Logos is in this sense the Heavenly Man even apart from His Incarnation. The Divine Wisdom, as the eternal prototype of the created world in God, is the substantial basis and contents of creation, being immersed in becoming. The Divine and the created worlds are correlated as the eternal and creature Sophia. They are identical in their basis, but differ according to the form of their being. The first is eternally existent in God. The second, having emerged from *nil*, is that which becomes; nevertheless, for it too Sophia is basis and final cause, its entelechy. The focus of the creature world is in man, created in the image of the Divine Logos. Man has an uncreated spirit, proceeding from God and summoned by God to personal existence, and also his nature, which is the world as the creature Sophia in its psychophysical organism. Sophia in the Creator and the creature is that bridge which unites God and man. In this unity consists the Chalcedonian positive, the basis of the Incarnation.

In Christ in the capacity of uncreated personal spirit is present the Second Person, the Logos, and His two natures are the Divine and created Sophia, heavenly and earthly manhood, one and the same principle in the two forms of Divine fulness and created becoming. Both natures, therefore, can be correlated positively through the communion of qualities, *communicatio idiomatum*, in the theosis of the created by the Divine. Sophia, as *God-manhood*, is the ontological basis of the Incarnation, which makes intelligible how "the Word became flesh." This point of view gives meaning to the identification of the two designations, Son of God and Son of Man, in that application to Christ which we have in the Gospels concerning the God-man. The union of two natures in the single life of a single Person can be understood only by starting

from the principle of the reduction (*kenosis*) of the Divine in the God-man to the measure of the human. This *kenosis*, however, must be understood, not as the relinquishment by the Logos of His Godhead (as in the theories of *kenosis*), but as His relinquishment of the Divine glory, the fulness of Sophian life, and His immersion in becoming. This path of renunciation is travelled by Christ until His human nature becomes capable of being glorified. The Incarnation of the Logos, the acceptance of the measure of human nature, the relinquishment of the fulness of Divine life and glory, the descent from heaven, are expressed in the fact that the limits of manhood are really for Him His own limits. For that reason is accepted the genuineness of His human development and limitation of knowledge and of His prayer. The miracles are regarded, not as the assertion of Divine power over the world, but as the action of a spirit-bearing wonder-worker on the analogy of human thaumaturgy. In the light of this general idea, of the immersion of the Divine self-consciousness in the measure of the human, is regarded the Gospel image of Christ with His God-human self-consciousness.

The features of this God-manhood are fixed in the doctrine of the three ministries of Christ. In particular in the prophetic ministry is noted its humanity, by virtue of which the Divine Truth bears witness of itself to men, not in its own Divine Person, as God, but according to the type of the prophets, though certainly excelling them; not as God, but as "rabbi" and "teacher," the God-man revealing His Godhead in man and through man. To the prophetic ministry belong all His works, in particular the miracles, which were characteristic also of the other prophets, in addition to which the contents of His prophetic message are Himself and His God-human form.

In the high-priestly ministry of sacrificial obedience in love to the Father and to men the chief significance belongs to redemption, also understood ontologically. The Incarnation is not only a means of redemption from sin, but the raising of man to God-manhood, to which he was summoned in creation. As a created being, however, as the creature Sophia, man is cut off from the Creator by an impassable abyss, which has been even more deepened because of sin as a consequence of the creature's inconstancy. God-love, creating man, takes upon Himself in pre-eternal counsel the Creator's responsibility for the restoration of the creature, inconstant in freedom. By the sacrifice of the eternally consecrated Lamb He redeems even this natural creaturehood and sinful inconstancy, raising man to his predestined God-manhood. Moreover, redemption is revealed not only as the act of the Second Person, but as the

joint act of the Holy Trinity. The God-man, by virtue of the unity of His human nature with humanity in general, is identified with the old Adam, and by the power of compassionate love makes Adam's sin His own. He bears the burden of the Father's anger against the old Adam, drawing on Himself forsakenness and death. This acceptance of the deadly cup of sin is fulfilled spiritually in Gethsemane, bodily on Golgotha, and is accomplished by death. Christ suffers spiritually and bodily as it were the equivalent of all human sins, all hellish torments for sin, and thereby destroys the power of sin, makes it as it were unreal, reconciles with God those men who of their own freedom will to receive and accept this reconciliation, this salvation. God glorifies Christ for this sacrificial obedience, whereby He restores mankind and becomes worthy and able to accept glorification. The last is expressed in the Resurrection and Ascension, which are accomplished by the Father by the power of the Holy Spirit, but at the same time by the corresponding God-human power of Christ Himself. Glorification belongs, therefore, to the high-priestly ministry and presupposes the uncompleted *kenosis*, which is overcome finally only when He sitteth at the right hand of the Father.

What remains to be ascribed to the kingly ministry? In contrast to the other two it is not concluded, but continues until the Kingdom of Christ is fulfilled on earth and He surrenders His Kingdom to the Father. The royal dignity of Christ was shewn by signs in His royal entry into Jerusalem. It is fulfilled by the power of Christ in the world through His faithful servants. The Apocalypse contains the symbols of that enthronement in the world, whereby it must be revealed before the coming of the end, tangibly on earth, before this age is accomplished.

The remaining parts of this book concerning the God-man will be devoted to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, ecclesiology and eschatology.

THE AUTHOR (*Tr. Q.F.D.B.*).

THE CHURCH ASSEMBLY

THE bold experiment of the Church Assembly has now been in existence for a sufficient number of years for criticism to have become possible and useful. The time has come when we may reasonably begin to form an opinion as to its achievements and methods.

In many respects it has justified the hopes of its promoters. It has succeeded in carrying into law a considerable number

of useful measures, which would have fallen to the ground under the old regime, because Parliament could not have found time to discuss them. The congestion of Parliamentary business had brought ecclesiastical affairs to an almost complete deadlock, and this unfortunate situation has now been ended.

At the same time certain serious weaknesses have become apparent.

The Assembly carries very little weight with the Church or nation at large. This was shewn by the fate of the Prayer Book. The Assembly passed the new book in 1927 by 517 votes to 133, an overwhelming majority in a very full house. The number of Acts of Parliament which can claim corresponding authority is very small. Yet this went for nothing "outside." The new book was treated, both in Parliament and elsewhere, as if it were being submitted for discussion for the first time, and as if its contents had to be considered *ab initio*.

This is probably due largely to the somewhat infelicitous circumstances of the Assembly's origin. It was born of an agitation conducted by a small group of men who were whole-hearted in their desire to promote the welfare of the Church. But the protagonists had little, if any, real first-hand knowledge of ordinary parochial life and work, and it is therefore very doubtful how far they understood one side of the situation with which they were trying to deal. The nation was exhausted with war, and dispassionate consideration of anything was more than ordinarily difficult. Few people really wanted the Assembly very much. Probably no one really wanted the cumbrous business of electoral roll and Church Council on which the whole system is based. The number of names which have been entered upon the rolls is disappointingly small, and does not seem to increase. The difficulty of keeping the rolls anything like complete and accurate in large town parishes is very great, and in practice adds to the kind of work which the clergy were not ordained to do. It is not always easy to get people to serve on the Church Council. The indirect method of election to the House of Laity means that the ordinary parishioner seldom has the slightest idea who his representatives in the Assembly are. (But it is only fair to say that no one seems able to suggest any alternative.)

In other words, no part of the system yet commands the volume of interest necessary to make it really strong and effective. The new regime has still to make its way and to win the general confidence, without which (as the fate of the Prayer Book has shewn) its best efforts will come to very little.

Its prospect of ultimate success depends almost entirely upon the parochial clergy. The rank and file of Church people

are unlikely to read printed propaganda or to be influenced by it if they do. Public meetings leave no lasting impression. What most people know or think about the Assembly, and its ways and works, will always depend chiefly upon what they hear from their own clergy. The parochial clergy still (*mirabile dictu*) command a not inconsiderable measure of respect in some circles. Their attitude towards the Assembly is what really tells. Their confidence and goodwill are the Assembly's best asset.

(It is also worth remembering that they really hold the purse-strings. The finances of the Assembly depend ultimately on the contributions from the parishes. The quota is seldom easy to raise. It is an unpopular tax, and in most parishes a real burden. Payment depends almost entirely on the zeal and energy of the incumbent.)

The Assembly started its career with a very considerable volume of goodwill amongst the clergy. They were quicker, naturally, than the laity to perceive the need of something of the kind, and to recognize the possibilities of the new regime. Whatever misgivings they may have entertained about the dumping of a parody of Parliamentary institutions on the Church, they were loyally ready to support the new order and to make the best of it in every way. That was eight or more years ago. Now mistrust and dislike of the Assembly are widely prevalent. This was admitted publicly by the Archbishop of York in March of this year, and his Grace acknowledged that whether the feeling were well- or ill-founded its undoubted existence was a serious matter.

What follows is an attempt to analyze the causes of this feeling and to suggest a remedy.

1. The centralization of business in London means that all power tends to fall more and more into the hands of a small body of people living in or near that centre. It was, presumably, to avoid this evil that the wisdom of our ancestors gave the North an independent ecclesiastical capital. It is difficult for clergy who have duties of any importance in the northern province to attend many meetings in London, especially in these days when almost all large parishes are inadequately staffed.

It is also expensive, as it must mean sleeping at least one night in London. Theoretically expenses are paid for attending committees, but this means no more than railway fare. Inhabitants of the province of York are perhaps expected to spend the night on the Embankment. During the session of February, 1929, a very prominent member of the House of Laity said, apropos of an amendment which had been proposed

to a certain measure, that as the members in charge had no strong views about it, members of the Assembly were *free to vote as they chose*. No doubt that was a slip of the tongue: but a very illuminating slip. It shews the real danger which there is of the Assembly becoming no more than a machine for registering the decisions of committees which have been reached elsewhere, and for investing them with an illusory appearance of weight. The parochial clergy, especially if they belong to the province of York, can take little if any part in the deliberations of these committees. I was born and brought up in London, and have spent twenty years in the northern province. I am therefore alive to the width and depth of the gulf in thought and feeling which separates London and its dependencies from England "beyond Trent."

2. The clergy, for the most part the parochial clergy, are the only people against whom any legislation passed by the Assembly can as a rule be enforced. No layman need be affected by it more than he chooses, and the Bishops are more or less beyond it. Any layman can, if he likes, ignore the Enabling Act and all its provisions entirely. Many in fact do. The clergy cannot. Laymen can only be invited to contribute funds; the clergy are compelled to pay. Accordingly we have in the Assembly a body which passes measures, which do not, or need not, affect a majority of its members. That is in itself a dangerous situation: especially as it may be laid down that nobody really understands parochial work until he has done a good deal of it: just as nobody can understand maritime affairs until he has gone to sea and stopped there for a considerable period. *Crede experto* both. There are as yet very few Bishops who have first-hand knowledge of Church Councils.

The Assembly has not, hitherto, paid any exaggerated deference to the views of the parochial clergy on matters which concern them vitally. The rapid change of front executed by the members in charge of the Cathedrals measure, when they found that the Chapters were solid against their first proposals, is in sharp and not particularly agreeable contrast.

So much for general grounds of dissatisfaction. Three particulars which call for mention are the Dilapidations measure, the Pensions measure, and the Patronage proposals.

1. The question of repairs to glebe houses and buildings has long been one of difficulty. It is really inequitable that the incumbent should be entirely responsible, and the recent rise in building costs has made the burden intolerable. The present measure, which originated in Convocation before the Assembly was born, will eventually make the charges a little less onerous by distributing them more evenly over a period

of years. Grants from central funds have also been made under it.

But most incumbents are very poor. When a very poor man has been ordered peremptorily to put his official residence into perfect order, by a standard which no lay landlord applies to his own property, and then to pay in advance, at what he may consider an exorbitant rate, for repairs which may (or may not) be needed in five years' time, the prospect of future benefits does not do much to alter his natural resentment, nor does it help him to pay his monthly household books and children's school bills now. Few things are criticized more keenly than any delay on the part of the parson in paying the local tradesmen. It is also said that diocesan surveyors sometimes place the insurance on glebe houses unnecessarily high, forgetting that drains and foundations, which accounted for a considerable portion of the original cost of construction, cannot be destroyed by fire.

The laity have been invited to contribute, but their response does not seem to have been commensurate with their opportunity. The new dilapidation rate, at least, might have been made a first charge on the parochial quota, the diocese and Assembly receiving the balance. This was not, however, suggested. In official eyes bricks and mortar seem to deserve more consideration than flesh and blood, and the needs of central funds override other claims.

2. The need of pensions to enable aged and infirm clergy to retire has long been obvious. The fact that the ministry is now recruited from men who are almost all entirely dependent on their professional earnings makes it more acute year by year; and may eventually compel a drastic remodelling of the Church's system.

The old Incumbents' Resignation Acts made it possible, in certain circumstances, for a retired incumbent to be awarded a pension out of the income of his last benefice. There was an obvious rough justice in the arrangement. It is true that the pension came out of the pocket of the retired man's successor, but then he had accepted the benefice on those terms; and the charge was necessarily terminable. Only about 600 benefices out of nearly 14,000 were in fact so charged in 1926.

The system was not, however, ideal, and was much disliked by the laity both as parishioners and patrons, because they found a benefice charged with a pension hard to fill. Of course they could have obviated this difficulty by making good the amount of the pension. But this was seldom if ever attempted.

Under the new measure (which does not apply to men who

were over fifty-six years of age on January 1, 1927), any clergyman who retires at the age of seventy, having served for forty years, will receive of right a pension of £200 a year. This appears to be a most generous provision. But how is the money to be provided? The Ecclesiastical Commissioners have given a capital sum of £400,000 and contribute £100,000 a year. These are large sums, but are not new money. They are derived from existing Church property, and the Commissioners' power of augmenting poor benefices has been diminished correspondingly. Indirectly this money comes out of the pockets of the poorer clergy.

£100,000 a year, or a little more, is raised by a new income tax of 7d. in the pound levied on the official income of the clergy. The reputed value of their house is included in the estimate of their income, and the tax has to be paid whether the income is actually received or not. The laity, as represented by the Church Assembly Fund, are invited to contribute £50,000 a year.

Of every £1 of pension which the clergy will ever receive a little more than 16s. will have been extracted from their pockets, directly or indirectly, first. The measure may ultimately be productive of solid benefits, but to describe it as "an insurance of parishes against decrepit clergy, mainly at the expense of the clergy," is not unjustifiable. For the moment it has made it even harder than before for the poorer clergy to keep out of debt.

As originally proposed, the payments of a man who died before reaching seventy were forfeit, so that his widow and family were in effect fined rather heavily for their premature loss. Now the money is to be returned to the estate with compound interest at $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The members in charge were compelled to give way on this point, which they did most reluctantly. The laity were not even asked to furnish the additional money required. It is to be obtained by reducing the better-endowed benefices in perpetuity as they fall vacant. The Church, as a whole, does not seem to be aware of this yet. It will be interesting to see how the patrons and parishioners of these benefices take it.

The principal sponsor of the measure was a distinguished member of a family of which it was said many years ago: "They are all clever but none of them has any common sense." His own great wealth obviously made it impossible for him to understand that the payment of a new tax of £10, £15, or even £20 a year could be a serious matter to anybody. It bears especially hardly on those clergy who before the scheme (which they are compelled to join) was passed had insured their

lives to the utmost of their capacity. I believe that the Pensions Board advises them to reduce their insurance—*i.e.*, diminish such provision as they have been able to make for their dependents.

When the measure was presented to the Assembly for final approval the promoters appealed for "sacrifice for the good of the Church." About 85 per cent. of those present were by age or station outside the scheme, and were therefore not asked to sacrifice anything themselves. Their vote that the sacrifice should be made was naturally almost unanimous. A few weeks later Parliament was told that it was a benefit for which the clergy were longing. Both descriptions cannot be equally accurate. Minor grievances under the measure are:

(a) Clergy who receive payments from the Commissioners or Q.A.B. have their tax deducted at the source. (This also applies to the dilapidation rate.) This arrangement is doubtless convenient to the central authorities, but it has, by a single stroke, placed the Commissioners and Q.A.B. in the position of owners of the funds which they administer, with the clergy as their salaried employees. In fact the clergy are the owners and these admirable corporations are merely trustees. The clergy are an estate of the realm, and strongly resent being treated like anything else.

(b) A question as to the number of persons employed in the Pensions Office and the salaries paid to them, and their pension arrangements, was asked in the Assembly. The answer given was that it was not in the public interest to divulge details. A bald statement shewing that office expenses are £10,000 a year has been published since. This Olympian attitude is unlikely to inspire confidence or goodwill. The clergy have a right to know exactly how their money goes.

(c) I happen to know that the question whether the work of a resident fellow of a college in Oxford or Cambridge counts as Church work "within the meaning of the Act" is still *sub judice*. To regard it as even a moot point simply amounts to penalizing outstanding ability. The passage of young clergy who possess the necessary qualifications from parish to academic work and back again is, I should have thought, to be encouraged in the interests of both. In any case, the matter is one for the Bishops to decide. The personnel of the Pensions Board does not suggest that their acquaintance with academic work is very intimate, or that their opinion as to its importance to the Church is of any particular value.

(d) Men who have served in the mission-field or as chaplains on the continent of Europe have, I believe, been told that the years which they have given to this work do not count.

3. The question of Patronage bristles with difficulties: and no system can be ideal. On the one hand, the immemorial status of the English parson has been, and still could be, the most powerful lever for good the world has ever seen. On the other, the laity naturally desire an effective voice in the selection of their incumbent, to be protected against violent changes in the services of their parish church. This is not unreasonable: though I doubt whether many of them would like the type of service which was usual in, say, 1829. If changes, which appear to have been unpopular when they were introduced, have been beneficial in the past, it is not inconceivable that they may still be desirable.

But the privilege of an effective voice in selection ought to carry with it the responsibility of an effective effort to support the man selected. At present there is little indication that this will be made. The incumbent is usually expected to be content with existing endowments, though not one of his parishioners would put up with a "pre-war wage" for a month. An Easter offering is usual now, but there are few parishes in which it reaches as much as £50. If it exceed this sum, part is often returned to the parish as a contribution to the assistant clergy fund. To what measure of control are the laity entitled for 10s. a week or less?

The clergy suspect that the objections of Church Councillors to a proposed nomination will generally be ill-informed or even frivolous. Yet if they are allowed to prevail they will inflict a permanent stigma on the reputation of their object. The clergy also know that the qualification which will weigh most with most Church Councillors is the possession of ample private means; next to this what they would regard as eloquence in the pulpit. Of course, in practice the laity will probably find that if they are not content with their patron's first nominee they have to wait long before they can get anyone else. I would venture to direct their attention to the opening words of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*:

"He that goeth about to persuade a multitude that they are not so well governed as they ought to be shall never want attentive and honourable hearers; because they know the manifold defects whereunto every kind of regiment is subject, but the secret lets and difficulties which in public proceedings are innumerable and inevitable they have not ordinarily the judgment to consider."

It is significant that the Crown has refused to tolerate any interference such as is contemplated by the measure now before the Assembly, with its absolute right of presentation to any benefice in its gift. Moreover, I have not heard of any

plans for giving dioceses an effective voice in the selection of their Bishops. The obvious inference, that whereas the incumbent of a parish really does matter, nobody cares what sort of men are appointed to be Bishops, is presumably not intended to be drawn.

It may be too late now to go back on what the Assembly has done; though, personally, I should like to see the Pensions measure, at least, reconsidered by a committee on which actual working incumbents of parishes, personally affected by the scheme, had a clear majority over all other members. That would go far to convince the clergy, even if no alteration were proposed, that their circumstances had had well-informed and impartial consideration. Possibly nothing else ever will.

It is clear that in future the Assembly must be content to go slower, and that more time for discussion of its projects must be allowed outside its walls and between its sessions. This is what I said in York Convocation on February 15, and an important ecclesiastical journal labelled my views ridiculous. The March issue of the *York Diocesan Gazette* shews that the Archbishop of York has come to hold not dissimilar opinions. As I wished to be quite explicit I suggested that the February session should be dropped. It follows very closely on the heels of the autumn session, and is very inconvenient for clergy who are engaged in preparing candidates for Confirmation. (Even the Pensions Board would presumably regard this as real Church work.) Two sessions a year separated by six months will be quite sufficient, and may incidentally help to reduce the administrative expenses of the Assembly which now stand at £27,000 a year. This sum is probably not excessive in itself, but is more than the Church can afford at present.

Between the sessions the Bishops might hold conferences about the measures before the Assembly with the clergy of their dioceses. These could be attended without having to sleep away from home, and would therefore tax time and pockets less heavily than a February session of the Assembly in London. If each rural deanery Chapter elected for the purpose 10 per cent. of its members (including at least one unbeneficed priest wherever possible), every part of the diocese would be fairly represented and the "synod" would contain from twenty-five to eighty members. This would neither be too large for real discussion nor too small to carry weight. Incidentally it would give the Bishops better opportunities than they enjoy at present for finding out what people who disagree with them really think.

In conclusion. The parochial clergy think that no one

understands their very difficult and complicated business as well as they do, and that they have had more than enough of well-meant but ill-informed interference. The new system inevitably imposes upon them more administrative work of the kind which was already a heavy tax on time and energy (at any rate in large parishes), and bears very little relation to anything which they undertook to do when they were ordained.

The Dilapidations and Pensions measures have made it harder for them to live. The proposals which have been made about Patronage seem likely to lower their prestige and thereby impair their usefulness. They feel that their honourable position is being steadily undermined. When the Assembly was created a good deal of rather foolish talk about "the failure of the Church" was current. Some members of the House of Laity seem to be under the impression that they have been summoned at the eleventh hour to save an institution which the blundering and incompetence of the clergy had brought to the verge of collapse. Accordingly the Assembly has had too exalted an idea of the part which it has to play. Of course it has done some useful things, and there are many quite important functions which it might discharge. (Among them would be persuading a large number of young men whose position gives them natural access to a variety of well-paid callings, that the ministry of the Church is the career to which they ought to devote their lives.) But it is not the Church: and if it is mistrusted and disliked by the rank and file of the parochial clergy it will find that it can accomplish very little.

There is still time for it to profit by its mistakes, and to recognize that its best asset is the invisible capital of confidence and goodwill with which it began its career. It can then address itself to the slow task of collecting again what it has squandered.

R. H. MALDEN.

N.B.—This article was written rather more than four years ago.—
R. H. M.

SOME FISHING STORIES IN THE GOSPELS

Mark i. 16-20; Matt. iv. 18-22; Luke v. 1-11;
John xxi. 1-14.

COMMENTATORS have long been divided as to whether Luke v. 1-11 is a description of a different incident from that related in Mark i. 15-20 and reproduced in Matt. iv. 18-22. Were the first apostles called twice, or has St. Luke given us an inaccurate reproduction of the call of the four, owing to his

having mixed up the story of the call with another tradition of a miraculous draught of fishes, also narrated in John xxi. ?

This latter theory casts grave doubts on the accuracy of both Luke v. 1-11 and John xxi. 1-14. According to it both evangelists are narrating the same event, but their information is so vague that each has assigned it to a different period of the ministry, and has given a version of it which conflicts in many details with the others. Moreover, if true, it invalidates the spiritual teaching drawn from a comparison of the two miraculous draughts of fishes by divines from St. Augustine onwards. It therefore seems well worth while to bring forward any fresh arguments which tend to indicate the accuracy of St. Luke's story, and to shew that his miraculous draught of fishes is distinct both from the call of the first disciples in Mark i. 16-20 and also from the second miraculous draught of fishes in John xxi.

Commentators who wish to vindicate St. Luke have already pointed out that the details of the stories of Mark i. 16-20 and Luke v. 1-11 are entirely different. In the two first Gospels Jesus is seemingly alone, and finds first Peter and Andrew engaged in fishing with a special kind of net—*ἀμφίβληστρον*. He calls them first, not to discipleship—they were disciples already according to John i.—but to evangelistic work, or rather to prepare for it. "I will make you to become fishers of men." James and John are found a little further on in their boat with their father Zebedee, mending or making ready their nets (*δίκτυα*). They also are called and leave their boat and go after Him.

In St. Luke's account our Lord is not alone, but is standing by the lake surrounded and thronged by a great crowd. Two boats are drawn up on the beach, and the fishermen, Peter, Andrew, James, and John, who are together on this occasion, are sitting near, not fishing or mending but washing their nets (*δίκτυα*). Jesus enters Peter's boat and gets him to thrust it out a little from the shore, that he may use it as a pulpit, and preaches from it to the people on the land. Then, when the sermon is over, he asks Peter to "thrust out into the deep and let down his nets (*δίκτυα*) for a draught" (v. 4). Peter, doubtful of success, since night is the best time for such fishing, yet obeys. The result is the miraculous draught of fishes, which makes necessary the help of James and John and their boat. Even so the nets break and many fish escape, and the boats are ready to sink.

Commentators from St. Augustine onwards point out how all the incidents foreshadow in an acted parable the work of the Church Militant on earth with all its partial failures and disappointments; whilst in John xxi. the final victory of the

Church and the gathering in of the completed number of the elect is implied.

The object of the present article is to strengthen the arguments for the accuracy of the two later passages (Luke v. 1-11 and John xxi.), first by shewing how accurately each of these three incidents represents a different stage in the routine of a fisherman's day, and secondly by suggesting a reason why a second call of the disciples, such as that narrated by St. Luke, was needed.

A note must here be given on the nets mentioned in the Gospels. Three words are used, and three types of net seem to be indicated by them, corresponding to the three chief kinds of net in use today:

1. ἀμφίβληστρον. This is a hand net, though of a different make from that used by most modern fishermen, since it is not used as a scoop, but, as the word implies, is thrown so as to fall in a circle. The outer edge is weighted and sinks first, and so it encloses the fish round which it falls. The fisherman does not employ a boat, but wades. Eastern travellers tell us that such a net is still in use in Galilee. Like modern hand nets, it could only be used close inshore and would usually be employed to catch small fish for bait.

2. σαγήνη (Matt. xiii. 47). This is the "seine" or draw net. It is also used close to the shore, one end being fixed to the shore, and the rest paid out in a half-circle from a boat till the other end is brought to shore, when both ends are drawn in, and the fish thus enclosed are landed. This is a large net and can land any size of fish. It is sometimes used on our coasts for salmon when they come inshore to enter the rivers. But it can only be used in shallow water where the bottom is smooth—a fact which the writer of the article on nets and fishing in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* seems not to have recognized.

3. δίκτυον. This is the Greek word for any kind of net. In the Gospels, however, unless the kind of net has already been mentioned—as in Mark i. 18—it seems to be used of the deep-sea net. This is evidently the case in Luke v. 4. The modern deep-sea net is let down into the sea in a long line at right angles to the probable course of the fish. The upper edge is supported by floats and the lower sunk by weights. It does not reach the bottom, which would be impossible in deep water, but is used for fish like herring, which feed near the surface and swim into it and become entangled in the meshes by their gills. It is drawn directly into the boat. Practical fishermen would, I think, agree that the net which made the wonderful catch of Mark v. 1-11 must have been of this type. No other type of net would have brought in a catch of four or five tons

such as would be needed to fill two large boats to sinking point. If a seine net had rent, most of the catch would have escaped.

Now as to the fisherman's routine. This is much the same everywhere. For many kinds of fishing, specially for deep-sea fishing with the large floating nets (*δίκτυα*), night is the best time. In hot weather the fish usually come to the surface to feed at night, and they are then less able to see and avoid the nets. Hence the fisherman puts off at evening, fishes during the night, and lands his catch early in the morning. Having done so, his next task is to wash or clean the nets, removing the seaweed or other flotsam which has become entangled in them. The nets are then spread out, or hung up to dry, and the fishers rest during the heat of the day. The late afternoon is the time for preparing for the next night's fishing. The nets must be examined and any holes repaired, and then they are folded in the boat in such a way that they will pay out easily when the time comes to shoot them. Also, since lines are often used in deep-sea fishing as well as nets, bait must be procured for the night's work. In Matt. xvii. 27 St. Peter uses a hook and line. It was clearly in this evening stage of their work that Jesus found the four disciples on the occasion of the call narrated in Mark i. 16-20, Matt. iv. 18-22. Peter and Andrew were going to do some line-fishing, and so were using an *ἀμφίβληστρον* to catch small inshore fish for bait. James and John were going to use their deep-sea nets (*δίκτυα*, Mark i. 19), and so they were mending and stowing them in the boat to be ready for the night's work.

The whole incident suggests the late afternoon when the fishers were preparing for the night's fishing. Luke v. 1-11 equally clearly represents an early morning scene when the fishers have landed and taken their nets out of the boats, and are washing them preparatory to laying them out to dry.

Lastly, St. John xxi. represents a still earlier stage in the fishers' day. It is just dawn (verse 4), and the boat, after a fruitless night, is approaching the shore when Jesus hails her crew from the beach. The light was not yet strong enough for them to recognize Him at a hundred yards distance. Again all the details are true to life. It is the deep-sea net (*δίκτυον*), which alone they have with them, which they let out at our Lord's command. It would be unusual to use such a net and make a big catch with it so close to shore; and that is part of the wonder of the story which St. John has to tell. It was equally unusual to be able to tow a deep-sea net to shore and drag the catch straight on to the beach, for as such nets were used usually far out (see Luke v. 4), the process would be too slow and laborious. So St. John specially mentions that the catch was

made only a hundred yards from shore (verse 8). At so short a distance to tow the net ashore would be the easiest and safest way of landing such a heavy catch.

The argument for the distinctness and truthfulness of each of these events is very much strengthened when we thus see that not only are the details distinct in each case, but that each event accurately represents a distinct stage of the fisherman's day, and that all the details are true to life and fit in, granted that we assume three events at three different times: the first in the late afternoon, the second in the morning, after the catch had been landed, and the third at dawn before landing.

It is perhaps worth mentioning that on a tideless lake it is much more easy to keep to a regular day's routine than it is on a tidal sea like ours. In English fishing ports, especially in the smaller and poorer harbours, boats must be launched and brought in when the tide suits, even though that may not be the best time from the fishing point of view.

We now come to the second part of our argument. If we can suggest a good reason why a second call to evangelistic work was needed by St. Peter and the rest, we shall have greatly strengthened the grounds for believing that Luke v. 1-11 narrates a distinct and second call following that described by St. Mark and St. Matthew. Now a careful reading of Mark i. 35-39, compared with Luke v. 1-11, does suggest grounds for supposing that St. Peter and the other earliest disciples did for a time give up assisting our Lord in His evangelistic work, and instead returned to their usual occupation of fishermen. Following the description of the call of the first four apostles, we are given in Mark i. 21-34 a description of the start of the Galilean ministry in the town of Capernaum itself. This consisted in Sabbath preaching in the synagogue and in healing sick and casting out devils in private houses and in the streets. St. Peter's own house seems to have become our Lord's headquarters (verse 29). St. Mark, as Turner specially remarks in the *New Commentary*, uses the pronoun "they" when describing the movements of Jesus and His disciples (verses 21, 29). The other synoptists in the parallel passages say "He." Turner concludes that St. Mark is here transcribing the story as St. Peter told it, and so simply alters St. Peter's "we" into "they." In view of this it is striking to notice that in verse 39, which describes Jesus' departure from Capernaum to preach elsewhere, "He" and not "they" is the pronoun used. This implies that when Jesus left Capernaum the disciples no longer followed Him. The verses which precede strengthen this suggestion. After a period of work which included at least one notable

Sabbath and which won the attention of the whole city, Jesus rose up very early and departed into a desert place and there prayed. Peter and his fellow-disciples followed eagerly. "Hunted Him down" is perhaps not too strong a rendering of *κατεδίωξεν*. They told Him: "All men seek for Thee." His success in attracting the whole population of Galilee's chief city and its neighbourhood (Mk. i. 28, 33) had doubtless made them hope that He was about to assert Himself as an earthly Messiah, and they have come to tell Him that the people of Capernaum are ready to acknowledge Him as such, and to urge Him to waste no more time in prayer or in efforts elsewhere, but to put Himself at once at the head of the enthusiastic populace. He, however, tells them that He is going elsewhere to preach in the smaller towns and villages. According to St. Luke, some of the citizens of Capernaum associated themselves with Peter and the disciples, and even tried to prevent Him leaving them, but without success (Luke iv. 42). We can imagine what a blow all this was to the disciples, and specially to Peter. It seemed to them that Jesus was missing a glorious opportunity, rejecting the allegiance of their native city, refusing St. Peter's hospitality and the use of his house as headquarters of the movement, and calling them to leave their homes and families and work for a task which seemed to them of comparatively small importance. We can hardly be wrong in taking the hint given in the "He went" of Mark i. 39, and concluding that our Lord went on this missionary tour of Galilee alone, whilst the disciples returned disappointed to their fishing. Such a conclusion enables us both to see the need of the renewed call narrated by St. Luke and to understand how wonderfully suitable was the method employed by our Lord.

St. Mark tells us (ii. 1) that at the conclusion of His tour of Galilee He returned to Capernaum. We may suppose that He reached the city in the evening when the disciples had already put out for their night's fishing. The news of His arrival would spread quickly through the town, so that when He went out next morning to the seashore, probably with the intention of recalling His disciples, multitudes followed Him. Meanwhile the disciples had returned from a fruitless night's fishing, and were dejectedly washing their nets on the shore when they saw Him approaching, again the centre of a multitude which hung on His lips. With what shame they would realize their mistake! He had known best after all how to win the people of Galilee, and they had deserted a glorious Leader and a glorious cause, to return to work which their last night's experience would make them feel was fruitless drudgery. How they must have longed to offer Him their services again, and yet shrank

from doing so for fear of a rebuff! And then, to St. Peter's joy, Jesus asks for the help he feared to offer, though at first all He asks is a very small thing—the use of his boat as a pulpit. How gladly must Peter have thrust out his boat and anchored it by the shore, and how eagerly he must have listened to the sermon which followed! What that sermon was we are not told, but we may suppose that, like all His sermons at this period, it dealt with the Kingdom of God. We may imagine how, as in the Sermon on the Mount, He described the Kingdom and its rewards as spiritual; how He sketched the character required in its citizens, and spoke of the work assigned to them of being the light of the world and of attracting others. As he listened St. Peter must have felt afresh the longing to join in such a glorious work, mixed with a deeper sense than ever of his own unworthiness as he realized that the Kingdom was something higher and holier than he had supposed. Could he, who had already been so unfaithful, ever again dare to offer his services to the King?

Again, Jesus does not wait for an offer but claims his service, though not as yet for spiritual work, but for something which lay within his own daily sphere. "Launch out into the deep and let down your nets for a draught." It was a harder test of his willingness to serve than the request for the use of his boat, for it meant accepting a landsman's orders in a matter connected with his own fisherman's trade, and the seaman's suspicion of the landsman peeps out in the reply: "Master, we have toiled all the night and have taken nothing." But his love for his Master conquers his pride and reluctance, and he adds: "Nevertheless at Thy word I will let down the net." The meaning for himself of what follows at once strikes home. Jesus has shown him by act clearer than any word that if he attempts to do his work and guide his life in his own way the result will be failure, as in his fishing last night. If he will surrender himself to Him, and do His work of fishing for men, and do it in His way, the results will be wonderful and fruitful beyond belief. Yet the sense of his past failure and of his unworthiness for a leader and a work, the holiness of which he now sees more clearly, appals him. The Kingdom is not to be realized on earth. Its rewards are higher but more intangible than he had supposed. And perhaps, as in the final Beatitude, Jesus had emphasized the need of suffering rather than action as the way of bringing in the Kingdom. It meant giving up all on earth for a Kingdom which, however glorious, seemed vague and distant. So, in fear and shrinking from the call and the sacrifice it involves and in despair at the thought of his unworthiness, he falls at Jesus' feet, saying: "Depart from

me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord." A success so great as that to which the miracle pointed could not be for one like him. But Jesus reads his heart and replies: "Fear not, from henceforth thou shalt catch men and draw them into life, as just now you have caught fish for their death." If the inference drawn above as to a temporary desertion by St. Peter is well founded, St. Luke's story of a second call to evangelistic work exactly fits the circumstances. And similar reasoning shews the fitness and probability of the second miraculous draught of fishes related in St. John xxi. For it too follows a final lapse by St. Peter and the others, and it too implies a renewal of the call to catch men instead of fish, and forms a fit prelude to the charge to St. Peter to feed and shepherd the sheep—i.e., to exercise pastoral oversight over the souls won by the evangelistic work to which he had just been called afresh. Moreover, the unique act of landing a catch from a deep-sea net directly on the shore is specially fitted to symbolize the unique final gathering of the Church triumphant at the last day.

If the critics who impugn the accuracy of Luke v. 1-11 and of John xxi. had known more about fishing, and had read Mark i. 21-39 more carefully, they would hardly have been so ready to talk of "conflations" and "doublets."

M. BUCHANNAN.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

PROFESSOR A. A. COCK of University College, Southampton, is well known to our readers. Father Sergius Bulgakov, the author of our second article, is head of the Russian Academy in Paris. His article is a self-review of his own Russian book. We owe the translation to the kindness of Dr. A. F. Dobbie-Bateman. The Dean of Wells has had many years of parochial experience in Yorkshire. Another voice from Yorkshire, of a fresh and unusual kind, is that of Mr. Buchannan, who hails (it seems the right word) from Whitby.

In the December number it was mentioned on the cover, but not within, that the Latin version of the 1928 Canon was from the pen of the Bishop of Truro. Readers who bind THEOLOGY in volumes, and so lose the covers, should note this for future reference.

CLERICAL DISCIPLINE

(From a CORRESPONDENT.)

Nothing makes the clergy more sad than cases of clerical discipline, to which the newspapers, anxious for good "copy," give far more space than their importance deserves. It is inevitable that a priest should sometimes find he has mistaken his vocation; that sometimes a priest should fall, sorely wounded in the struggle with temptation. But the problem of publicity is peculiarly one of the Church of England. The Nonconformist minister, entirely dependent on the offerings of his people, drops out of the ranks quietly when things go wrong. The Roman Catholic priest is under strict discipline and his license can be revoked at any time. The Anglican clergy inherit from feudal times an independent position from which they can be dislodged only with great difficulty and at the expense of much publicity.

So ingrained is the habit of looking upon a Bishop as an ecclesiastical policeman that many clergy prefer the present system with all its disadvantages to any change which would put them at the mercy of the Bishops. They have had no voice in the choice of their Bishop, and they utterly mistrust a code of discipline which is one-sidedly applied to priests only, the laity being left alone, and the Bishop acting independently of his Metropolitan and co-Provincials.

Pending a change in the Law, which must come sooner or later, could not something be done by voluntary action on the part of the clergy? Many of us would be content to be tried by our "peers," by a court of fellow parish priests. Such a court could be trusted to keep the balance between letting down the honour of the clerical profession and exacting a standard of pastoral efficiency in a difficult parish which cannot reasonably be expected from weak humanity. I am not referring to the weighing of evidence, which must be left to trained legal minds, but rather to the deciding of what is, or is not, unprofessional conduct. The clergy should be allowed, like army officers or doctors, to have their own code of honour, to which all are expected to conform. Cases are sometimes brought before the courts which ought to be settled in this way. To give one example only. Nearly every priest occasionally finds himself in a situation as regards a woman, which if it were discussed in the law courts might be so treated as to damage his reputation. A woman may be in bed in a lonely cottage, her attendant having left her for an hour to do some

shopping. The priest knocks at the door, which is open, and is told to come in. He spends a quarter of an hour in a woman's bedroom with no one else near. He would feel it an intolerable outrage if he were accused of wrongdoing and had to defend himself in a court. And yet the presuppositions of a secular court would be all against any man, clerical or lay, who put himself in an equivocal position like this.

My suggestion is that the clergy should voluntarily bind themselves to abide by a decision of their peers in matters concerning professional conduct, and, if asked to do so, should resign their curacies or livings in cases of pastoral negligence or grave indiscretion. In many such cases, guilty or not guilty is not the issue. A humble-minded priest would gladly own his fault if he were treated in this way. As it is, he must defend his character or be ruined. A priest, with his continued *mea culpa*, ought not to be put in a position in which an advocate maintains his spotless innocence.

I am not suggesting anything legal, only a plan by which two-thirds of the clerical discipline cases might be prevented from coming into court at all. It carries with it the corollary that some form of subsistence allowance would have to be given. Now we have a system of compulsory pension payments something could perhaps be arranged in connexion with the pensions scheme. But it would have to be supplemented by a voluntary levy on the clergy. Serious as any additional burden would be, almost any price would be worth paying to lessen the shame of "clerical scandals." It is worth mentioning also that the suggested plan would help to solve the "wastage of man-power" problem, for, scandal having been avoided, a priest could often make a new start after a period of penitence and recollection.

CORRESPONDENCE

SIR,

In Father Hebert's valuable article there is an aspect of the question which he does not emphasize, and which I wish someone more competent than myself could bring out.

No one who worships at the Eastern Liturgies can fail to realize the greatness and the balance of their Trinitarian ascription, and to worship with the East at the Feasts of the Epiphany and of Pentecost is to be powerfully affected by the Eastern doctrine of the Trinity, and to see in the Liturgy the same manifestation of the Divine Persons as at the Jordan and the first Whit Sunday, i.e. the Father—the *Arche* of the Godhead—sends His Spirit to bless, to consecrate, and transfigure all that is in time, because of the representation to Him of the perfect Sacrifice of His Beloved Son. Is not the consecration in all sacrificial rites the answering Divine response to the acceptable offering?

The cause of the loss of the Epiklesis in the West, as submitted by Father Hebert, is not suggested by the experience of those who worship at the Eastern Liturgies. Our Lord is honoured *throughout* the Liturgy as High Priest and Victim (witness the great dignity and awfulness of the Great Entrance), whereas in the West one has now a sorrowful feeling that His Presence is ignored till the Words of Institution (witness the horrible modern custom of sitting at High Mass till the Sanctus and after the Ablutions).

Was not the loss of the Epiklesis the result of a loss of a theology of the Third Person in the Middle Age? And has not the loss of the Epiklesis

resulted in a growing tendency to a "unitarianism of the Second Person" in modern Western devotion?

It would seem as if the true Catholic worship of the Trinity were at stake, and the recovery of the Epiklesis a theological necessity: but can we separate the oblation of the earthly gifts which symbolize God-created nature and man's working life from the "oblation of the whole Church," as Father Hebert seems to suggest?

Yours faithfully,

M. ALEXANDER.

DEAR SIR,

In the "Editorial" article of your December issue it is stated that the Archbishops' Commission on Doctrine was appointed in 1924. But it was, in fact, appointed in 1923, and actually met in full session for the first time in September of that year at University College, Oxford.

There seems to be some malign influence attached to this date of 1924 which leads to its incorrect substitution for others; for I find in a book of my own, which is reviewed in the same number of *THEOLOGY*, that I have left uncorrected in a note on p. 134 a statement assigning to that year the death of Baron Friedrich von Hügel, which, as I well knew, happened in 1925.

Yours faithfully,

CLEMENT C. J. WEBB.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses. January, 1933.

This number is mainly occupied with accounts of the festivities held in connection with the celebration of the quincentenary of the foundation of the Theological Faculty in Louvain University. Correspondence with Rome, the address of welcome by the Archbishop of Malines and reports of various speeches are given. Pope Martin V. set up a *Studium Generale* in Louvain in 1425, and Eugenius IV. by his Bull of March 7, 1432, permitted the erection of a Faculty of Theology and Canon Law. The University and the Faculty continued in existence until the French Revolution, but were totally suppressed by the decree of October 25, 1797. In the year 1834 they were revived. The Dean of the Theological Faculty, Fr. Bittremieux, contributes an account of the activities both of the old foundation and of the revived. He is able to give a long and honourable list of names of theologians educated therein. Some of the best known names, however, such as Michael Baius (1513-1589) and Cornelius Jansen, the Bishop of Ypres who wrote the "Augustinus" (died 1638), are under some suspicion of heresy and are passed over (in ordinary type) as quickly as possible to give more space to those, also from Louvain, who refuted them, mostly names quite unknown to the general reader but here honoured by "small capitals." But the Faculty has a very fine record to shew in all departments of theological study. Of the other articles in this number the longest is a Latin disquisition on the rules for marriages between Christians and non-Christians. There is also a very interesting essay on the "Wings of the Soul," shewing how the metaphors of the Psalmist (lv. 6) and Isaiah (xl. 31) were mingled in the thought of Origen with the myth of the "Phædrus." The soul loses her wings, and then she turns from God and descends earthwards. The theory is associated in his mind with ideas of pre-existence and of an exaggerated doctrine of free will that St. Jerome characterizes as Pelagian. There is the usual very full bibliography and many detailed reviews.

W. R. V. BRADE.

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique. October.

This is particularly important, for in it the editors survey all that has been published in the different learned quarterlies throughout Europe bearing directly or indirectly on the subject of ecclesiastical history. Nor do the Louvain Fathers take any narrow view of their subject, for they cover such departments as the literary sources of the Middle Ages, legal institutions, the history of dogma, the history of science and literature, the history of art, the history of particular Churches and of religious corporations. Now this is an enormous field to survey, and the debt of the scholar to this periodical is sufficiently evident. There is an index of names to this issue which is of the utmost value to the research student. In addition to all this, there are the usual articles. Father Zeiller concludes his view of the conception of the Church of the first four centuries. He sums up his evidence in conclusions, though we seriously wonder if his view of the importance of the see of Rome is one that can be historically sustained. Father de Lager continues his learned account of the Albigensians during the crisis of their fate, and he devotes almost sixty pages to the consideration of his theme. Father Constant reviews the religious awakening in France at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and students of the Oxford Movement will see that this Movement was much more cosmopolitan than is usually assumed. It is ten thousand pities that our English history is still studied so much apart from that of contemporary history in Europe. An article like that of Father Constant will correct our grave insularity of outlook. R. H. M.

Jewish Quarterly Review. Vol. xxiv., No. 2.

Professor Eduard König writes a short article on *The Truth of Old Testament Religion*, in which he argues, sometimes convincingly, against modern rationalistic methods of interpretation.

Solomon Katz contributes a useful study of *Pope Gregory the Great and the Jews*, shewing that pontiff's treatment of the oft persecuted race to have been distinguished by its humanity. Gregory, throughout his pontificate, acted consistently with the advice he gave to the Bishop of Naples: "Those who really desire to win to the true faith such as are strangers to the Christian religion should endeavour to effect their purpose by kindly words, not by harsh actions, lest ill-treatment should repel those whom just reasoning might have attracted. Those who act otherwise, and under this pretext wish to restrain the Jews from observing the customary rights of their religion, are clearly acting for themselves rather than for God. Do not, in future, therefore, allow the Jews to be molested in the performance of their services. Let them have full liberty to observe and keep all their festivals and holy days, as both they and their fathers have done for so long."

Phineas Mordell gives an interesting note on *The Beginning and Development of Hebrew Punctuation*.

Dr. Bernhard Heller continues his description of the scope and contents of Louis Ginzberg's great work *The Legends of the Jews*, which we hope to see one day reviewed in these columns. One of the most interesting sections in Heller's lengthy and valuable article is that dealing with Philo, whom Ginzberg is inclined to regard as a Jewish thinker with Greek training, rather than a Greek philosopher with Jewish education. Yet in Philo Ginzberg finds echoes of Plato and Aristotle.

R. D. MIDDLETON.

REVIEW

NORTHERN CATHOLICISM. Studies in the Oxford Movement and Parallel Movements. Edited by N. P. Williams, D.D., and Charles Harris, D.D. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

Professor Williams' essay on the Theology of the Catholic Revival overshadows all the other articles in this outstanding and important work. The volume was originally planned as an exposition of the various aspects of the Oxford Movement; then came Dr. Williams, who laid the cuckoo egg of Northern Catholicism in the homely Tractarian nest. This unusual proceeding is both fortunate and unfortunate; fortunate because it seeks to relate certain tendencies in recent Anglicanism to world conditions, unfortunate because it imports a highly controversial atmosphere into a wholly admirable study of Tractarian principles.

In these circumstances the work naturally divides into two parts. Twelve essays deal in temperate and compendious fashion with the various phases of the English Catholic Revival. These begin by two historical chapters in which Canon C. P. S. Clarke and Dr. Sparrow Simpson trace the progress of the Movement before and after the fatal 1845; then follow articles on the Movement in America and in the Mission Field; on the Moral, Pastoral, Social, and Æsthetic Aspects of the Revival; on the Deepening of the Spiritual Life and on the Restoration of the Religious Life; on the Spiritual Independence of the Church and on the Ecumenical Ideals of the Movement. We know of no other single volume in which the manifold activities of the Catholic Revival are set forth with the wealth of scholarship and erudition here revealed. These articles alone justify the purchase of the book, and on this account we offer it a cordial welcome.

The second part is concerned with Dr. Williams' provocative article, supplemented by satellite chapters on the influence of Catholicism in German Lutheranism, Dutch Calvinism, Scottish Presbyterianism, and English Methodism, together with an excursus on the Old Catholics. As to Dr. Williams' own essay, to which his Foreword supplies the key, we confess ourselves amazed at such an exhibition of loose thinking; after some twenty pages devoted to a rapid sketch of the Tractarian theological outlook from Newman to Gore in which Pusey is utterly ignored and his masterly *Eirenicon* not even mentioned, the author proceeds to set forth in the remaining eighty pages his theory of Northern Catholicism—a term which he uses as a synonym for “non-Papal Western Catholicism”—and over

the whole chapter he modestly writes the title "The Theology of the Catholic Revival."

Before we examine the theory itself we must glance at the method of argument characteristic of Professor Williams. As we do so we are reminded of Talleyrand's description of the dress of a certain woman : *Il commence trop tard, il finit trop tôt*. The argument is nominally addressed to "an educated Japanese gentleman," who is assumed to be already a theist, indeed a monotheist, and who is gradually led forward until he sees the Anglican Church (under the influence of the Catholic Revival) as the Catholicism of the Northern peoples, who in the author's view will never "return *en masse* to their old allegiance to a Power which is now . . . even more absolute than when they rebelled against it" (p. xi.). The writer's style is disfigured by the continual putting forth of hypotheses which are afterwards blandly assumed as demonstrated. Thus on p. 162 it is asserted that our Lord "may well have left behind, not a document, but a group of men in possession of His mind"; and four lines later we read : "That is precisely what He did do." A worse instance of this method occurs on p. 206: "Such a conclusion harmonizes in a peculiarly satisfying way with the observations which . . . I have already made." This tendency to rest upon unproved assumptions is even more powerfully revealed by the language employed. The word "reasonable," with its derivatives, occurs with monotonous regularity: "There is no reasonable doubt," p. 191. "When reasonably construed," p. 192. "It is reasonable," p. 195. "Reasonably clear," p. 196. "This assumption may be reasonably deemed to be justified," p. 199, and so forth. In these circumstances it is not entirely surprising that the author from time to time gets entangled in his own premises; thus, *e.g.*, on p. 232 he animadverts upon the influence of heredity in determining religious profession, pointing out that the Breton is normally a Roman Catholic and the Scot a Presbyterian. It follows from this that the Englishman is normally an Anglican—but not to Professor Williams, for only one page earlier he has written: "We *choose* to belong to the Anglican Communion (rather than to any other organized Christian body) because we are satisfied, on examining its formularies and its practical working, that . . . it offers to us the full sacramental life of Catholicism without imposing impossible terms of communion."

With these examples before us we approach Dr. Williams' main theme with a certain misgiving. His main point is this, that there are two possible theories of Catholic unity: "peripheral," dependent upon a centralized papacy, and "structural," based upon the episcopate. The Papal "theory" is summarily

dismissed in half a page "for reasons which it is obviously impossible here to explain at length" on the authority of the familiar writings of Gore, Puller, and Denny; and though the author goes on to note in passing, "I do not deny that the germs of Papalism appear in Rome itself at a very early date," he continues: "But I cannot convince myself that these claims were put forward *semper*, or ever accepted *ubique*." This paves the way for the conclusion in the next line, "It would thus seem impossible to regard the 'Papal theory' as belonging to the fundamental mind of the 'Undivided Church about itself.'" Thus the Papal claims are blandly branded as impossible on the strength of a halting subjective conclusion of Dr. Williams.

This leaves the way open for the consideration and justification of the structural conception: "In the Apostolic Ministry running through the Great Church from East to West, and from Timothy and Clement down to Leo IX. and Michael Cerularius, we see the desired identification-mark, the bond of cohesion, the common grain of the institutional structure" (p. 207). This conclusion is emphasized by a quotation from Dr. Gore, in which vital stress is laid upon the function of the Bishop: "Of the Church's unity the Bishop is in each community at once the symbol, the guardian, and the instrument. He is the instrument of it because 'the Bishops, who succeed to the Apostles by an ordination which makes them their representatives,' are the successors of that sacerdotal authority and grace with which Christ endowed His Church, and which is necessary for her existence." We might suppose that the discussion on unity is now concluded; but no, we are next told that it is not the office of a Bishop which is in question but "the principle of transmission," with an implication that Presbyterian orders are valid (pp. 207-9). The distinctive institutional quality "of the Universal Church" is thus asserted to be "the possession of a ministry which can claim to be the living continuation of the original ministry ordained by the Church's Lord Himself," with the proviso that this includes the Presbyterians. Again we suppose we have reached the end of the enquiry. But once again, no. At this point Dr. Williams is confused by the recollection that there are many persons who do not admit that this was the belief of the immediate sub-apostolic Church; and he is assailed by two further doubts: there was a "dark period" at the end of the first century, and moreover the position he has asserted is "not embodied explicitly in any Creed or definition of Ecumenical acceptance." He therefore reaches, at long last, the extraordinary position that "the mind of the undivided Church" cannot be pressed further than "to require willingness to use the ordinance in

question as a strict condition of Church fellowship," and goes on to say that: "The weight of *auctoritas* which lies behind the traditional basic doctrine of the Apostolic ministry is sufficient to justify its being taught, and to require its being consistently acted upon, as truth; but not sufficient to justify the branding of its denial as 'heresy.'"

Let us apply this conclusion to the conception of the unity of the Church which is Dr. Williams' main object of enquiry. In his view unity based upon the centralized Papacy is "impossible"; unity based upon the Episcopate is normal; unity based upon the presbyterate (*i.e.*, upon succession), though doubtful, is sufficiently established "to justify its being taught as truth"; but those who repudiate the Papacy, the Episcopate, and the Presbyterate are not to be branded as "heretics" (? schismatics). We may, perhaps, be permitted at this stage to rub our eyes and enquire, Where is Unity? Where is Catholicism? We are not surprised to find that Professor Williams holds those to be within the Church who in defiance of his theory of structural unity do in fact remain outside. "There are those," we read on p. 220, "who prefer to adhere rigidly to the patristic *usus loquendi*, according to which "the Church has one sense, and one only, and those who are out of communion with it cannot be said to be in any degree whatever 'members' of it; there are others, amongst whom the present writer is to be numbered, who prefer the more modern terminology which is prepared to recognize genuine Christian virtue outside the bounds of historical and technical orthodoxy." And so all this discussion comes to the conclusion that by using the word "Church" in two senses we can have Father Ronald Knox's "Reunion all round." In our judgment this conclusion could have been reached by a process of less complication.

The remainder of our space must be devoted to Dr. Williams' notion of *Northern* Catholicism, a term which the author uses as short for "non-Papal Western Catholicism." Clearly this is a loose designation; in the geographical connotation North and West are not identical, and the attempt to describe differing psychological outlooks by this terminology is unsuccessful, inasmuch as the writers upon whom the Professor relies to outline the ecclesiastical economy claimed to be embodied in post-Tractarian Anglicanism—Gerson, Nicholas of Cusa, Colet, Erasmus, Pascal, Bossuet, Febronius, and Scipione de' Ricci—are for the most part Italian and French. However, these are mere debating points; Dr. Williams is on sure ground when he asserts a specifically Teutonic outlook upon life and religion. By the help of a telling quotation from Tacitus (*Germania*, vii. 1), he outlines two determinants of Teutonic mentality: (1) "its

respectful, but always potentially, and often actually, critical attitude towards executive authority and its depositaries"; and (2) its freedom from survivals of pagan folk-religion. These two qualities Professor Williams discerns in contemporary Anglicanism, and it is for this reason that he ventures to set out the English Church (in its Catholic aspect) as Northern Catholicism, not without a hope that the Church of England, gathering round her the German Lutherans and Dutch Calvinists, and in communion with the Old Catholics, will eventually embody a definite type of Catholicism. There are two objections to this aspiration: in the first place the Anglican Church is still a long way off from the time when she will be a city at unity in itself, and secondly, there actually exists in Germany today, in communion with the Pope, a Church which possesses a membership equal in number to the whole Anglican Communion.

There are many other points raised by Professor Williams' essay: the nature of Catholicism, for instance, or the historical development of Catholicism; the constitution of the Church, or the principle of authority. But we have written over-long already. Looking back upon the article as a whole, we are left with a conviction that Dr. Williams is too prone to regard religious truth apart from its embodiment in the Catholic Church; thus he sets out authority as descending in declining stages of assurance as time elapses and schism broadens. He starts from Christ as the supreme Authority, places Scripture next, then the Creed, then the sacraments, then the ministry. Each of these elements of Catholicism, in his view, possesses a successively smaller degree of authority—i.e., of certainty. It is significant that he finds no place for the Church in his series, and there is a point of view which solves the problem he deals with by asserting that a thing is Catholic because it is part of the Catholic Church: and thereby throws the argument back on to the nature of the Church. In this view all Dr. Williams' hesitations about the authority of separate elements of Catholicism would be swept away. Short of this view Catholicism ceases to be objective and becomes a mere subjective Catholicity. This distinction is put very beautifully by Newman. "I illustrated it," he wrote in the *Apologia*, "by the contrast presented to us between the Madonna and Child, and a Calvary. The peculiarity of the Anglican theology was this—that it 'supposed the Truth to be entirely objective and detached, not' (as in the theology of Rome) 'lying hid in the bosom of the Church, as if one with her, clinging to and (as it were) lost in her embrace, but as being sole and unapproachable, as on the Cross or at the Resurrection, with the Church close by, but in the background.'"

J. L. BEAUMONT JAMES.

[The subject of this review is dealt with in our editorial columns.]

NOTICES

STANDPOINTS. Centenary Press. 2s. 6d. each.

Gambling. By R. C. Mortimer.

Marriage and Divorce. By K. E. Kirk.

Eugenics. By Leonard Hodgson.

MARRIAGE, CHILDREN AND GOD. By Claude Mullins. Allen and Unwin.
6s.

If the new series of "Standpoints" maintains the high level of these three small books, it will be a real contribution to clear thinking on some of the vital issues of today. In a preface to the series in general, Professor Kirk, the General Editor, tells us that the contributors "share the common conviction that nothing will more promote the cause of genuinely Christian progress than the frank expression of personal points of view, put forward as theses for discussion and criticism."

Mr. Mortimer discusses both the theoretical question of the legitimacy or otherwise of gambling as such, and the practical problems in regard to it which confront the Christian in the world of today. He rejects the position advocated by the Archbishop of York and Canon Peter Green that gambling is *in esse* immoral, but holds that it is only under very restricted conditions that it is right to gamble. The following paragraph summarizes his position: "These are the general conditions which determine the limits of legitimate gambling. No part of our livelihood must be made *dependent* on our gambling. The prizes which we stand to win must not be out of proportion to our general standard of living. The amount which we spend on gambling must be limited to a proportion, moderately small, of our surplus wealth. The interest of gambling must not distract us at all from our proper work, and only for limited periods in our leisure." This is in effect a re-affirmation of the general tradition of moral theology; and there is much effective criticism of the more rigorist position.

But the argument is not always completely cogent. Mr. Mortimer claims that civilization has "rendered life secure and comparatively immune from chance," and that it is therefore legitimate deliberately to reintroduce the "missing element of surprise and uncertainty." Such a contention might have been weighty had it been urged twenty years ago; but it is difficult to discover this security and certainty in the post-war world. Again, he urges that the grown man rarely receives presents, which are so great a source of joy to the child, and that gambling combines the element of a present with that of a surprise. Yet is it not true that the real value of a present, whether to a child or to an adult, lies in the fact that it is a sacramental expression of love, and it is this which is absent in the receipts of gambling? It may be quite true, again, that moderate gambling causes no obvious moral deterioration; but when we argue thus, is there not a danger of accepting as our moral standard the ordinary "good man" and not the Christian ideal of the saint? There will be many who cannot refute Mr. Mortimer's arguments who yet will feel it impossible to find a place for gambling in the life of one whose aim is to be perfect as our Father in heaven is perfect.

Dr. Kirk's own book on Marriage and Divorce is a masterpiece. It is difficult to know which to admire most—the wide range of his knowledge,

the clarity of his reasoning, or the conspicuous fairness with which he states his case. He begins by a careful analysis of the nature of marriage itself, and what differentiates it from other kinds of sexual relationship. Then he turns to the subject of divorce, pointing out that the doctrine of the indissolubility of marriage was a novelty brought into the world by Christianity; and he shows how the stricter teaching of the Primitive Church came to be modified in the East by the concession of divorce and in the West by rules (sometimes sophistical) about nullity. In passing, he gives a critical discussion of the supposed exceptive clauses in our Lord's teaching as recorded in Matthew, leading to the conclusion that the Gospels afford no support for the laxer tradition of the Eastern Church. To those who profess to find it incredible that our Lord should have spoken so explicitly on the subject of marriage he replies that "the attitude of the early Church in the matter makes it even more incredible that He should *not* have done so." The more common modern argument that though our Lord may have said things which implied the total indissolubility of marriage "He was stating an ideal, but was not legislating" is then considered; and were it not for the known perversity of the human mind one would be disposed to think that the argument would never again be heard, so masterly is Dr. Kirk's reply. In the concluding chapter the present situation in the Church of England is considered, and we are brought face to face with the problem whether it is possible to uphold the uncompromising Christian standard of indissolubility and yet to find some way of administering the discipline of the Church which does not press too hardly on human weakness. Every parish priest would do well to read the book, which deals so admirably with a problem that is never far away from us.

Canon Hodgson, in dealing with the Christian attitude to Eugenics, naturally covers some of the same ground as Dr. Kirk. He insists that "the commendation of Christian marriage, and its true development, must be the first plank in the platform of the Christian eugenicist"; and his positive statement of the ideal of Christian marriage is quite beyond criticism. His main concern is to relate this to the scientific knowledge of the laws of heredity and to avoid the risk of "following the guidance of our Christian hearts without enlisting the forethought of our Christian heads." The problem is an acute one, because it is the Christian principle of caring for the weak which has gone far to abolish natural selection in the human species. There can be little doubt that many Christian thinkers, unconsciously discerning this apparent conflict between the religious and the scientific outlook, have refused to face the facts as science discloses them; this is manifestly wrong, and Canon Hodgson rightly emphasizes the implications of our belief in God as Creator and therefore as revealed in natural processes. Clearly the biologist must be regarded as an ally of Christian truth; but it is necessary to guard very carefully against the risk of relegating our fellows to "a biologically inferior class" after considering *only* their physical qualities. Doubtless Canon Hodgson is aware of this danger, but sometimes we wonder whether he succeeds altogether in escaping it. It is when we come to methods of practical action that we find ourselves faced with highly controversial matters such as contraception and sterilization. Canon Hodgson rightly claims that these must be discussed in the light of reason and not by mere instinctive prejudices; and his own treatment of the subject is of course on a very high level. He welcomes the vote of the majority Bishops in 1930, but it is noteworthy that, like most other apologists for Resolution 15, he departs further than

the Bishops themselves from the traditional view in his readiness "to recognize that there may be circumstances which justify marriages that are deliberately childless from the start, in which case the use of some artificial means of preventing conception will be inevitable." The fact that a writer whose general attitude of mind is so much in accord with tradition is driven to this position and to the defence of sterilization justifies the critics who claimed that Resolution 15 was not the recognition of an occasional exception to a general principle, but involved the introduction of a radically different conception of the meaning and significance of marriage; and it would be well if this were faced by all who discuss the matter, whether as defenders or opponents of contraception.

Mr. Mullins writes as a magistrate whose experience has brought him an intimate knowledge of some of the darker side of married life in London; and his strong human sympathy as well as his first-hand knowledge give him a right to be heard. It is almost inevitable that one whose time is so much taken up with police court work should see the darker side of life a little out of proportion, but when all allowance is made for this it cannot be denied that he has given publicity to facts which cannot be ignored. It is the silent appeal of these facts, rather than the arguments based upon them, which gives its value to the book. Mr. Mullins writes as "an unhyphenated Christian": and one wonders what intellectual basis this involves when one discovers that his belief in the after-life is weak, that he holds that the immortal soul of a husband is "a trivial thing in comparison with the lives of the mother and children," and that he regards the Christian path as one along which non-Christians can tread; certainly such a philosophy can know nothing of the grace of God as that is understood in Catholic theology. He falls into the snare, which Canon Hodgson is very careful to avoid, of equating the economically "poor" with the eugenically "unfit"; this is manifest in his quotation from Dr. Drysdale on p. 156, and in the use he makes of quotations from Mr. Patterson and Professor Burt on pp. 206 and 209. And surely Christians will hesitate to accept the implication of a reference to unemployment benefit on p. 107, that those who have been deprived by society of the opportunity of obtaining work must be further penalized by being also deprived of marriage and parenthood. Everyone knows the problem of those who "marry on the dole," but can this be the right way out? Nor are his theoretic arguments in favour of contraception any more convincing—e.g., when he argues that "to the truly religious all knowledge, contraception included, comes as part of God's ordering of the universe," one has only to substitute "the art of using poison gas" for "contraception" to see how utterly lacking in cogency the argument is. He is on much stronger ground in his welcome insistence on the importance and the possibility of self-control, and in his plea for fuller teaching on the subject of marriage by the religious leaders. But it is difficult to see how the clergy in general can give effective teaching until the laity are ready to give fuller recognition to the moral authority of the Church. Doubtless an individual priest or minister here and there can teach effectively on the strength of his own personal prestige; but such men are the exception; and the problem is that most people who come to be married in church come to the clergyman in much the same spirit as they would come to a registrar, and with no greater readiness to accept him as their moral teacher. It is easy to criticize; and some readers will be more and others less ready to agree with Mr. Mullins' practical suggestions; but those who

disagree most strongly are also those whose duty it is to read his book and face the challenge of his facts.

PERCY HARTILL.

THE ENGLISH WAY. Edited by Maisie Ward. Sheed and Ward. 7s. 6d.

This book, the sub-title of which is "Studies in English Sanctity from Bede to Newman," is a collection of biographical essays by a number of cultured English Roman Catholics, including such well-known writers as Fathers d'Arcy, Jarrett, and Martindale, and Messrs. Belloc, Chesterton, Christopher Dawson, and E. I. Watkin. They write, of course, with a purpose, which is none the less clear for being kept in the background. It is to illustrate, by biographical examples, the claim of the modern Roman Church in England to be the true spiritual descendant of pre-Reformation Catholicism. In other words, their thesis is that the English Way is a Roman road; whether their demonstration appears convincing will no doubt depend on the religious orientation of the reader. The essays are, however, conspicuously free from the controversial spirit, and are well worth the attention of any Anglican reader who enjoys concise, vivid, and sympathetic biographical writing. With Bede, Boniface, Alcuin, Alfred the Great, and Wulstan as its representatives in the pre-Conquest period, the English Way is traced through the Middle Ages in Aelred, Becket, Dame Julian, and Langland. Fisher, More, and Champion typify it in the turmoil of the Reformation, and it then proceeds through Mary Ward, Crashaw, and Challoner to Newman, who, rather surprisingly, appears as its nineteenth-century example. All the essays are interesting and informative, but special interest attaches to that contributed by the Editress on the little-known but fascinating seventeenth-century figure Mary Ward, who appears almost as a second Teresa of Avila in her efforts to establish a new order in the teeth of the most violent opposition. Altogether this book is in the best Sheed and Ward tradition.

E. L. MASCALL.

MAN. Papers read at the Summer School of Catholic Studies, held at Cambridge, 1931. Sheed and Ward. 7s. 6d.

A mere glance at the names of the writers of these papers shews us that they included some of the foremost Roman Catholic theologians of today; and we look with interest to discover how far we can find ourselves on common ground. There is much that is valuable in the sphere of philosophy, especially in Dr. Sheen's very able paper on "Moral Law and Freedom," and we can appreciate the spirit of real devotion that underlies Archbishop Goodier's concluding paper on "The Redemption." But those of us who have grown up under the influence of the "Lux Mundi" school can only lay down this book in a spirit of amazement. The whole method of discussion of the early chapters of "Genesis" seems to belong to a world that has passed away, and it is hardly surprising to discover that those who start from such presuppositions go on to assure us, as Dr. Flynn does, that "Catholics must believe in the unity of the human race as derived from a single human ancestor; no Catholic is free to deny the 'peculiar creation of the first man' or the 'formation of the first woman from the first man'; no theory of evolution which tries to embrace this teaching can commend itself to scientists." Professor N. P. Williams' Bampton Lectures are quoted, but we are assured that there was no

difference between the attitude of the Greek and Latin Fathers on original sin. Abbot Vonier speaks of "the profoundly Catholic concept, which is a denial of all evolutionism in man's history, namely, that man started at the very top, in wealth of intellect and in splendour of will and love," etc.

Theories of evolution may be open to serious criticism, and we shall not make the mistake of the nineteenth century of finding in them the key to all truth. But we cannot dismiss modern thought as a whole in this light-hearted fashion, and Anglican readers will feel an increased thankfulness that it is possible for those who are in communion with Canterbury to think with a freedom which is apparently still denied to those in communion with Rome.

PERCY HARTILL.

THE FINALITY OF JESUS FOR FAITH. An Apologetic Essay. By Alexander Martin, D.D., LL.D. T. and T. Clark. 5s.

In a comparatively short book of some 200 pages Dr. Martin contrives to cover considerable ground. His starting-point is the popular theory of historical relativity and of evolution which refuses to allow any kind of finality either in religion or in any other province. But he advances a closely reasoned argument in favour of regarding Christ and His revelation of God as final and complete. The emphasis is laid on Christ's Person. He eludes and exceeds all our categories. He is Rabbi, but He is Himself more than His teaching. He is Messiah, but is no mere hero-king of Jewish tradition, He has a special relationship with God, "the Son of the Father." His disciples know Him for sinless, yet they reach this conclusion from no "process of induction," but sinlessness follows from the unique Sonship. It is a judgment of faith, only to those who already recognize Him as Messiah is it inevitable. For such, in Him, "that which is ethically perfect is come." He is furthermore Saviour and Judge. In any view of the universe that regards it as not altogether indifferent to human ends, the doctrine of salvation is the touchstone. Salvation means that inner harmony and peace which are essential to a true reconciliation of the world and the soul. The words of the institution of the Eucharist shew that in His view "His blood will ratify a new covenant . . . will create . . . a community of men in perfect fellowship with God, Whom they shall fully know and shall freely obey." Justice, righteousness, and judgment go together both in the Old Testament and in the later Apocalyptic writings, so the Bringer of righteousness and justice, of mercy and reconciliation, the Inheritor of the Prophets, naturally claims to be the judge. "He accomplishes the purpose of the ages; and to His person the destiny of mankind is linked indissolubly." He is Himself that in relation to which all must be tried. Thus the claims of Christ are throughout consistent and all of a piece.

The book is written with great charm of style and shews wide and scholarly reading in all the important critical literature of the day. It is a real contribution to modern apologetic.

W. R. V. BRADE.

SAINT WULSTAN. By John W. Lamb, M.A. S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d.

This study of the life and times of Wulstan, Bishop of Worcester, forms a notable addition to the publications of the Church Historical Society, and the Society is to be congratulated on producing the first book of so capable a young writer. Mr. Lamb has made full use of the manuscripts

in the British Museum, and in the Cathedral Libraries of York and Worcester, as well as the contemporary chronicles. He bases his work on the *Vita Wulfstani* of William of Malmesbury, and on the Durham MS. of the Miracles of Wulstan, both edited by Mr. R. R. Darlington for the Royal Historical Society (1928). The appearance of Mr. Lamb's book so soon after the latter publication illustrates the fruitfulness of securing good printed texts of medieval documents. Indeed, much new writing on the ecclesiastical history of the Middle Ages will take place as the harvest of the palæographers gradually appears in print. Mr. Lamb's book is a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the Norman Reformation of the Church.

Wulstan was the only one of the Saxon bishops allowed by the Normans to retain his see. Mr. Lamb completely refutes the suspicion of illiteracy cast upon him, and supplies ground for doubting whether the Saxon clergy were so generally ignorant and moribund as is generally supposed. It is just possible that Böhmer's evidence consists of a string of exceptions, and that further research might do something to modify the impression created by his conclusions. Anyhow, Wulstan fully justified the confidence placed in him by William the Conqueror and Lanfranc, by the support which he gave to the policy of Church reform. He even surpassed Lanfranc in the vigour of his regulations against the married clergy. Mr. Lamb clears up the difficulty of the legend of the pastoral staff, and among many other little matters of elucidation he corrects Freeman's assertion that Wulstan made a profession of obedience to Stigand. The Canterbury-York dispute is referred to in the light of recent investigations. A most readable chapter describes the diocesan visitations conducted by Wulstan, but Mr. Lamb appears to overlook the fact that this regular perambulation was probably influenced partly by the necessary contemporary custom of consuming the produce of the episcopal manors *in situ*.

A. J. MACDONALD.

L'IDÉAL RELIGIEUX DES GRECS ET L'ÉVANGILE. By A. J. Festugière, O.P. Paris. J. Gabalda et Cie.

This new volume of the *Études bibliques*, with its preface by Père Lagrange, is wholly admirable. It belongs to a class of book rather rare in England. The text is simple and clear and can be appreciated by any intelligent reader. The footnotes, on the other hand, are very elaborate and give such full quotations from Greek authorities that they are valuable to specialists. The reason for our not having such books is presumably the cost of printing Greek.

The first part treats of philosophy, in five chapters dealing with Plato, Aristotle, Epicurus, the Stoics, and the Neopythagoreans. The second part discusses religion, under the headings of the failure of the philosophers, *Heimarmene* (fate), the mysteries, mysticism, and popular beliefs in immortality. The last forms a charming little monograph based on inscriptions. The aim of all this religious striving was "salvation," leading up to life with the blessed. Life of a kind beyond the grave was assured; what was sought was happiness—not seeing God for His own sake, rather a continuance of life as we know it but without its miseries.

There are long and learned appendices, filling half the book. The book proper ends thus (p. 169): "The Cross illuminates the obscure striving of the Greek soul. The idea that sacrifice is salvation, that happiness is

obtained only by total abandonment to one higher than one's self, that suffering makes us great—this idea, the secret strength of the heroes of tragedy, finds its true formula. The most solitary heart accepts its suffering if it can offer it to a God who has Himself suffered for it. The striving after divine union no longer appears as a dream; the blood of God attests his love."

Rarely has the distinctive quality of Christianity been brought out better than in this delightful book.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

THE ADVENTURE OF FAITH. Father Andrew, S.D.C. Mowbray. 1s. 6d.

How do Father Andrew's books get known? Chiefly, I should say, by personal recommendation. A man will go to a friend of his, and, rather shyly, confess some difficulty and ask for a book that will help him in the spiritual life. The friend will say, "Well, if you want something that has helped *me*, try one of Father Andrew's books. He used to be a painter—still paints, I believe—and he is still a human being in spite of being a priest. There's nothing sentimental about him, and he is not one of those slap-you-on-the-back Christians. It's the *real thing*. He knows what he is talking about."

Father Andrew does know. Buy the book and see.

AELFRIDA TILLYARD.

THE GLORY OF PRIESTHOOD. By E. Seyzinger, Priest in the Community of the Resurrection. Mowbray. 5s.

In this admirable book, Fr. Seyzinger "has set himself the task to try and make explicit the principles of priesthood which lie implicit in the English Ordinal" (p. 126). "The ordination contract of priests marks them as men who have willed themselves in unreserved surrender to God" (p. 90). But "in the stress of a busy life they are not immune from the subtle danger of exhibiting, by no means insincerely, a zeal for the extension of the kingdom of God or for the advancement of souls in sanctity, that exceeds their zeal for the progress of their own spiritual life" (p. 7). He therefore reviews in this book various aspects of the priest's life and work—the nature of his calling, his life of prayer both public and private, his temptations, and his need of a disciplined life. The book abounds in passages of fine insight. The value of mental prayer is not to be measured by its immediate and conscious results: "many are in danger of losing the rich blessings of mental prayer at the very point when they are most near to them. . . . For the very desire to pray, the very pain felt over conscious inability to form prayers, are evidences that souls are in the right direction. . . . Spiritual things are not real because they are perceived—they are perceived because they are real, and at best they are only imperfectly perceived" (pp. 51, 52). And with regard to the use of time: "the priest who, because throughout the day he has been careless and haphazard as to the use of his time, endeavours late at night, long after he ought to have been in bed, to make up arrears of sermon preparation or general reading, is not the man likely to be fresh and prepared for worship in the morning. He will fail to rise in sufficient time to pray well, and will hurry to church in the effort—often unsuccessful—to begin the service quite punctually. . . . The clerk who goes daily to work at bank or office knows quite well that unpunctuality will not be tolerated. Why

should God's clerk be less exact?" (p. 67). This book deserves to be widely read, and not only among the younger clergy, to whom it is specially addressed. Nor must the reader be content with a general impression that he ought to be living a more disciplined life: good intentions require to be put into practice.

A. G. HEBERT, S.S.M.

BOOK NOTES

The English Churchman Abroad. By R. C. Streatfeild. S.P.C.K. 2s. net. This little book is a manual of devotion for those attending the Latin Mass when travelling abroad. After a short introduction explaining the structure of the Latin Mass the service is arranged in three columns. In the middle is the Latin Mass with a parallel translation, and on the opposite page the corresponding parts of the English rite are given together with other suggestions for devotion. The book is certain to be of value to those who use it. There are places, however, where the translations of the Latin prayers might be preferred to the devotions suggested.

A. R. B. W.

After the Tractarians. By the Rev. Marcus Donovan. From *The Recollections of Mr. Athelstan Riley*. Philip Allan. 6s. In this volume Messrs. Philip Allan bring to an end their series of six volumes on the Tractarians, bridging the gap between Newman, Keble, Pusey, Hurrell Froude, Dean Church and our own day. We are reminded of the famous fragment of Papias, with Father Marcus Donovan as the new Mark, setting down the reminiscences of that very apostolic man, Mr. Athelstan Riley, "not, however, in order."

The chapter headings will give some idea of the scope of the work: "Some Notable Men and Women," "Church Building," "Bishops," "Preachers and Preaching," "Usages," etc. There are many interesting sidelights on the growth of a great movement; and the ecclesiological and antiquarian details will while away a pleasant hour—indeed, we sometimes seem to catch the very tones of Mr. Riley's voice.

We could, however, have wished that the book had been more strictly history or biography; and it is marred by repetitions and a want of chronological exactness, inevitable, perhaps, in stringing together reminiscences stretching across half a century. And we should like to have heard more of the deep things of the Spirit, of redemption, and penitence, and sanctity, and progress towards the Beatific Vision.

J. L. B.-J.

The Lectures of St. Matthew. By T. L. Aborn. Morehouse Publishing Co., Milwaukee. \$2.50. A 600-pages simple explanation of St. Matthew's Gospel, published at a relatively low price, would be welcome in normal circumstances. But Mr. Aborn's method is abnormal. He contends that the different sections of the Gospel are notes of lectures delivered to theological students. Each lecture had a title, corresponding roughly to its subject-matter. That title is found in the genealogy of chapter i. Moreover, the list of contents is there given backwards. Thus, ii. 1-23 is called "Joseph"; iii. 1-17 "Jacob"—Jesus supplants John; iv. 1-11 "Mattham," a gift; etc. *Sat prata biberunt.*

The Third Œcumenical Council and the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome: A reply to the Encyclical "Lux Veritatis" of Pius XI. By Chrysostom, Archbishop of Athens. Faith Press. 1s.

The Catholic Faith and this Generation. By T. Dilworth-Harrison. Mowbray. 3s. 6d. cloth, 2s. paper. This course of addresses delivered to undergraduates at the University Church, Oxford, will be welcomed by parish priests as an admirable example of what addresses to educated young people should be. An undergraduate said to the missionary with alarming candour: "Your ticket is not brains but experience." None the less, a great deal of reading and thought has gone to make this book.

The Purpose of Life. By C. B. Mortlock. Skeffington. 3s. 6d. Short addresses for Lent and Easter.

Doubts and Desires. By Dudley Symon. Skeffington. 3s. 6d. Advertised as a "Keble Book," this comes as a pleasant surprise to those who are getting tired of reading about the Sermon on National Apostasy. It is a study of educational problems by a headmaster with Catholic convictions and contains many wise reflections expressed in a most interesting manner.

Cross and Chalice. By G. F. Naylor. 2s. 6d. *A Parson's Thoughts on Pain.* By G. E. Childs. 1s. 6d. *God's Husbandry.* By A. O. Hardy. 1s. 6d. *In the Light of the Cross.* By H. E. Hubbard. 1s. 6d. *The Body Crucified.* By G. P. Ford. 1s. *What England owes to the Oxford Movement.* By S. L. Ollard. 6d. All are published by Messrs. Mowbray and are good examples of the popular literature for which that firm has so high a reputation.

The Old Testament and the Apocrypha. By A. C. Toyne. Arnold. 3s. An unusually thoughtful book, intended for the higher forms in schools and to meet the need of guidance in understanding the spiritual message, in disentangling historical truth, and in relating Hebrew religion to scientific knowledge.

The Art of Intercession. By Francis Underhill. Mowbray. 1s. 6d. Another of the little devotional books which the Dean of Rochester does with such unfailing wisdom, helpfulness, and knowledge of human nature.

Know Thyself. An Aid to Self-Examination. By James Wareham. Mowbray. 2s. The Archbishop of York's commendation is thoroughly deserved: "I cordially commend *Know Thyself* as a guide to self-examination which observes carefully the proportions of the Christian character, is quite free from all tendency to scrupulosity or fussiness, and is spiritually penetrating and enlightening."

W. K. L. C.